

W.B. 50

THE  
U N I T Y  
O F  
G O D

Not inconsistent with the

*Divinity of* CHRIST.

BEING  
REMARKS

On the PASSAGES in

Dr. *Waterland's* Vindication, &c.

Relating to the

*Unity of* GOD

And to the

Object of WORSHIP.

*Q. M. 2. . . . . Hodge.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for JOHN CLARK at the Bible  
and Crown in the Poultry. MDCCXX.

(Price Six-pence.)

The Author is a grave, sober, Writer,  
 & Ingeniously speaks his Mind, without  
 any Doublings, or Disguise. It is a  
 Satisfaction to any Man, who has no  
 concern for any thing but Truth, to  
 have such an Adversary to deal with.  
 G. Dr Waterland's Pref. to his 8. Sermon. in  
 Defence of the Divinity of St. John  
 Chap X. p. 20.



- P. 5. 61. Of three Persons  
 11. 2. Of the Word, God  
 16. 3. Of the Unity of God  
 38. 4. Of the Worship





# THE UNITY OF GOD

Not inconsistent with the

## *Divinity of* CHRIST.

**T**HE Controversy now on foot is of no small Importance to every Christian; and therefore ought to be stated in such a clear and easy manner, as that every plain Reader may be able to understand it. They that can read only their Mother-Tongue, have a right to be assisted in judging of the main Questions relating to the *Unity and Worship of God*. Neither does it exceed their Capacities to form just Notions in the Case. Indeed, there are many Arguments urged by Writers on both Sides of the Controversy, the Force of which cannot be made fully apparent to such as are not skill'd in the learned Languages. But I hope it will appear, that there are Arguments sufficient, both in Number and Strength, to gain

gain the rational Assent of the *Unlearned*, to the Truth in this Case; as well as Words enough in our own Language to give them clear Apprehensions of it, and of all the important Parts of the Doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity. We have no reason to doubt, but that an allwise and good God has provided sufficient means for the Instruction of the Vulgar, in the great and fundamental Articles of Christianity; and has afforded them a sure Mark, whereby they may distinguish Truth from Falshood, in all considerable Points.

It has been the Complaint of some, that tho' so many learned and excellent Discourses have been publish'd of late in this Controversy; yet still there is wanting a plain Introduction for the use especially of the *Unlearned*, which should shew them how to solve the Difficulties relating to the *Unity* of God, and the *Object of Worship*. I have here made an Attempt in this kind, with a particular View to the *English* Reader, whose Capacity, I hope, I have not exceeded. And if I have made the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, concerning the *Unity* and *Worship* of God, plainer than has been hitherto done, I presume, this Service will not be unacceptable to the World.

As I design this Discourse barely for an *Introduction*, it cannot be expected that I should run into all Parts of the Controversy, or give an Interpretation of every Text that relates to it. This has been done already to excellent Purpose, by Dr. Clarke, Mr. Jackson, and the Author of *Plain Christianity defended*. And when the Reader apprehends what I have here written, he will be able to read those learned and ingenious Authors with more Satisfaction, to whom I refer him.

The Parts of the Controversy, which I have undertaken, are these four; To prove that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three *Spirits*; that the Word God signifies some *Character* or *Relation* of Jehovah; to state and prove the true Notion of the *Unity*, and of the *Worship* of God. And while I explain these things, I shall consider what Dr. Waterland has said relating to them in his *Vindication*, &c. Since the Doctor's Book has made so much Noise in the World, and is boasted of, as unanswerable, among all sorts of People, I thought it necessary that there should be an Answer to the main Parts of it, fitted

1. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100.

fitted for the use of the less Learned, as well as a full Confutation of it for the Perusal of others. I rejoiced to hear that the latter is undertaken by his learned Adversary, and I have presumed to attempt the former, hoping to do Service, where his larger Book may not reach. Tho' I have made Remarks on few Passages of the Doctor's, yet, they being the most material, the rest will not convince any one, who is satisfied, that these are weak, and inconclusive. And the Doctor plainly lays the greatest Stress upon *them*, as appears by his repeating them so often: Indeed, they are the Sum of what is of any Weight in his Book.

### L. Of Three Persons.

It is proper, in the first Place, to consider the meaning of the Word, *Persons*, in this Controversy; and one would expect that Dr. *Waterland* would have given a clear Account of the meaning of the Word. I turn'd to pag. 350, which is the only Passage I could find to help me in the Case. The Doctor's Words are these: "I certainly mean a *real Person*, an *Hypostasis*, no *Modes*, *Attributes*, or *Property*, as you might easily have perceiv'd. — I shall only add here, that each divine Person is an individual intelligent Agent: But as subsisting in one undivided Substance, they are all together, in that respect, but one undivided intelligent Agent." The first of these Sentences, indeed, shews, that the learned Doctor is not a *Sabellian* (as many, that applaud his Book, are known to be) and that he supposes the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be three *real Persons*. And since, by *real Persons*, he means not *Attributes* or *Properties*, I would ask him, whether he can mean any thing less than three distinct Spirits? I imagine he would say he does. But then I would beg him to let us know what that is, which is supposed to be the *Medium* between a Spirit and an Attribute of a Spirit. Can what he calls *real Persons* be more than Attributes, without being distinct Spirits? Or can they be any thing less than distinct Spirits, without being as little different as Attributes? No one can have any the least Notion of a *Medium* in this Case; and therefore, whoever talks of it, talks without a Meaning. I presume the Doctor has no Idea of a *Medium* between a Spirit and



an Attribute of a Spirit: And then, by his own Rule, he himself does not believe there is any. For, says he, p. 309, *where there is no Idea, there can be no Assent.*

The latter Part of the Citation is an express Contradiction in Terms. "Each Divine Person, says he, is an individual, intelligent Agent: Yet — they are all together — but one undivided intelligent Agent. That is to say, *Three Agents are one Agent; or, three Persons are one Person: They are three, and yet but one in the same Respect.* Indeed the Doctor inserts a Clause, which he seem'd to design as a Salvo, and to obviate the Charge of a Contradiction: "They are all together, *in that respect*, but one undivided intelligent Agent." He here appears, at first sight, to talk of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in two different Respects; and to say, they are three Agents in one Respect, and but one Agent in another. The one Respect, he speaks of, is, *As they subsist in one undivided Substance.* I ask him, what is the other Respect which he hints at, and in which they are three Agents? Must it not be, *as they do not subsist in one undivided Substance?* If it differs from the other, it must be this; and yet I hardly think the learned Doctor will suppose they do not subsist in one Substance, in any respect whatsoever. 'Tis plain then, that the Doctor does not here consider the Three Divine Persons in two different Respects: And therefore I am sure my Charge is just, that he asserts them to be three Agents, and yet but one Agent in the same Respect, which all the World will own to be a Contradiction.

Upon the whole, I must declare myself not satisfied in the Doctor's Account of the Personality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: And to speak freely, I do not think that he believes them to be three Persons, in the proper Sense of the Word; or, indeed, in the Sense which he himself seems to give to it: For, if a Person be an intelligent Agent, I can't see how one undivided intelligent Agent can be more than one Person.

But, to avoid any needless Disputes about the Meaning of a Word, I shall, for the future, rather call them three Spirits, than three Persons. It is generally denied by our Adversaries that they are so, tho' some few of them have ventur'd to maintain it. With these I agree in this Particular; and shall now shew what Reason we have for it. We hold,

That

p. 10.

p. 9.  
p. 11, 54

*That the Father, Son; and Holy Ghost are three distinct Spirits,  
as truly as three Angels, or three humane Souls are.*

This I prove, in the first place, from the Scripture's calling each of them separately a Spirit. The Father is called a Spirit, *John iv. 23, 24. The Father seeketh such to worship him. GOD is a Spirit. The Word GOD* here signifies, not the Trinity, but *the Father*, as appears from the foregoing Verse, and as the Pretenders to Orthodoxy also allow. Our Saviour is speaking only of the Father in this Place, and plainly discovers to us, that, by *GOD*, he means only one Person. He does not say, *GOD is a Spirit: and they that worship it*, meaning the Divine Nature; or, *They that worship them*, meaning the Trinity; but *They that worship HIM*; that is, that one Person whom he named before, even *GOD the Father*. So that when he says, *GOD is a Spirit*; he means, *GOD the Father is a Spirit*.

The Word or Son of *GOD* is a Spirit. Thus he is styled, *Heb. ix. 14. Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself, without Spot, to GOD*. This eternal Spirit I judge, with many learned Commentators, to be the Word himself. Or, if any should contest this, I presume they will agree in the Sense of *Rom. i. 4. where the Apostle says, that Jesus Christ was declared to be the Son of GOD with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness. The Meaning of the Apostle in this Place is clearly this, Christ was the Son of David, as to the Flesh, or consider'd as a Man; but the Son of GOD, as to his Spirit, or consider'd as to what he was before his Incarnation. So that the Son of GOD is a Spirit*.

I need not add, that the Third Person in the Trinity is a Spirit. Every one knows, that he is continually called *the Spirit, or the holy Spirit, the Spirit of GOD, &c.*

From hence I argue; if the Father is a Spirit, the Son a Spirit, and the Holy Ghost a Spirit; then they are three Spirits, not one Spirit only. A Spirit, a Spirit, and a Spirit, I take to be three Spirits; even as a Person, a Person, and a Person are three Persons. And it can no more be said, that they are one Spirit, than that they are one Person.

But

2. But that the Son of G o d is a distinct Spirit from the Father, and was so before his Incarnation, will appear by considering, that they have two distinct Understandings, and Wills, which is an unquestionable Evidence of two Spirits. Their two distinct *Wills* are mention'd, *John vi. 38. I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me.* Here is the Will of the Son, and the Will of the Father who sent him; and these so plainly distinguish'd, that no one can think 'em to be one and the same Will. Indeed, the one is not opposite to the other, as the Wills of two Men may be; yet they are as really distinguish'd, as these. Suppose *Solomon*, when made King, during *David's* Life, had said to the People, *I am come among you, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of David:* Would not every one have granted, that this prov'd them to have two distinct *Wills*, notwithstanding that they did not clash? And must not then the like Saying of the Son prove that the Father and he have two distinct Wills? And let it be remember'd, that our Lord here speaks of his Will, as to his highest, or divine Nature. The humane Nature did not come down from Heaven; and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak of a Will that belong'd to his humane Nature, distinct from what he had as G o d. He that came down from Heaven was the W o r d; and then 'tis plain that the W o r d had a Will distinct from the Will of the Father. And, where there are two distinct Wills, there must be two distinct Spirits. For, I believe, no one will suppose that there are two Wills in one Spirit.

Again, the Father and the Son have two distinct Understandings. This will evidently appear, if I can prove that the Father knew what the Son did not. But 'tis plain, that the Father of Christ knew when the Day of Judgment should come; whereas the Son did not. This our blessed Lord informs us, *Matt. xxiv. 36. But of that Day, and Hour knoweth no one, no, not the Angels of Heaven, but MY FATHER ONLY.* Here Christ asserts, that his Father only knew that Day. Now his Father is the first Person of the Trinity; so that we may say, the first Person of the Trinity only knew it; and then the second and third did not. Whence it is clear, that the Father knew



knew what the Son did not; and consequently, that they have two distinct Understandings.

But where there are two distinct Understandings, and two distinct Wills, there must be two distinct Spirits. Will any one say, that there may be two Understandings or Wills in the same Spirit? Can a Spirit have one Understanding, which shall know a thing, and another Understanding, which, at the same time, shall not know it? Can the same Spirit have one Will that he came to do, and another which he came not to do? Surely this proves the Father and Son to be two Spirits as much as it would that two Angels or humane Souls are so. No Reason can be assign'd, why the Argument should be accounted valid in one Case, and not in the other. I conclude then, that the Father is one Spirit, and the Son another Spirit, and not two *Somewhats* in the same Spirit.

And to confirm it, let it be observ'd, that the Scripture always speaks of 'em as such. Thus, whenever the Scripture speaks of two, or of the three divine Persons together, it uses the same Words as we do to denote two or three distinct Spirits or Beings. The Words *We, Us, They, Them* are us'd, when the Father and Son are spoken of together, in many Places. Thus, *Job* xiv. 23. *If a Man love me he will keep my Words, and my Father will love him; and WE will come unto him, and make OUR Abode with him.* *John* xvii. 21, 22. *That they also may be one in US. That they may be one, even as WE are one.* Again, *Gen.* i. 26. *And GOD said [that is, to his Son] Let US make Man, in OUR Image, after OUR Likeness.* And *Isai.* vi. 8. *Who will go for US?* See also *Gen.* iii. 22. xi. 7.

From such Expressions our Adversaries argue rightly, in my Judgment, that, in those Places, more than one Person is spoken of. And I add, I think, 'tis as clear, that the Words denote more than one single Spirit. I am sure, in any other Case, where *Persons* are spoken of, they would allow us to infer from hence, that they are distinct Spirits. Why then should not these Words be thought to signify as much also in the Case before us? Why should this be made an Exception from the general Rule? Or, if it must, how do they come to know, that tho' *WE*, in all other Cases, signifies, at least, two Beings or Spirits, yet this same Word applied to the Fa-

B

ther

p. 5, 6, 10.

ther and Son shall not signify such a Distinction between them? I do not remember that the Scripture gives 'em any Hint of this. And all that I can conceive they will say, is, that the three divine Persons are not separate Beings or Spirits, like three created Persons. But this is the very thing in question, and so will not be granted 'em without Proof. And when any one attempts to prove it, it will be time enough to think of a Reply. In the mean while, I would ask our Adversaries, why we must not think the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be three distinct Beings, as well as three created Persons are so; since the Scripture constantly speaks in both Cases in the same Manner?

*p. 9.* 4. Besides, there is not one Argument which proves them to be distinct Persons, that will not as necessarily determine that they are three Beings. Let us try one or two. That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three Persons, is evident, in that the Son took upon him the humane Nature, and suffer'd in it, whereas the Father and the Holy Ghost did not. Now, if the Son suffer'd, and the Father did not; surely they must be more than two distinct *Somewhats* in one and the same Spirit. If they are both one Spirit, it would be a Contradiction to say, *The one suffer'd when the other did not.* For it would be evidently the same as to say, *This one Spirit did suffer, and this one Spirit did not suffer, at the same time.* I beg the Reader carefully to consider this; and to try, whether he can have any Notion of one single Spirit's having one Distinction in it that suffers, and another that does not. Remember, at the same time, what Dr. Waterland grants, that *Where there is no Idea, there can be no Assent.* And then I shall not fear, but that you will own, the Doctrine of three Persons in one Spirit is not to be believed. I am sure, I may as well say (tho' 'tis absurd with a witness) that there are two Distinctions in my Soul, one of which may really suffer, when the other does not.

*p. 6.* 5. There is another Argument to prove the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be three distinct Persons, which fully confirms my Assertion also, viz. because the Scripture speaks of 'em in the same manner as we do of three different Persons. The Argument is certainly unanswerable. And I may as well add, *They are three distinct Spirits,* because the Scripture speaks of them in the same manner as we are

are wont to do of three different Spirits, which sufficiently appears from what I have already said.

Once more, it is well urg'd by our Adversaries, that the Distinction of the divine Persons is evident from hence, That the Father sends, and the Son and Spirit are sent. And they use to confirm it by saying, *The same Person cannot send himself*. And may not I as well say, the same Spirit cannot send itself; and he that sends, must necessarily be a distinct Spirit from him that is sent? What greater Evidence than this can we possibly have of distinct Spirits? Certainly one Attribute of a Spirit cannot send another Attribute of the same Spirit. I conclude then, that the Father is one Spirit, the Son another Spirit, and the Holy Ghost a third Spirit. And if the Reader will honestly weigh what I have here said to confirm it, I shall not despair of his thinking the same, nor need he fear being censur'd as a Heretic for this, since Dr. Sherlock, Mr. How, Athanasius, and other Orthodox Fathers have maintain'd the same in their Writings. p. 6.

## II. Of the Word, G O D.

"The first and most general Distinction of the Senses of the Word, G O D, should (as Dr. Waterland rightly observes, p. 47.) be into *proper* and *improper*. After which it will be soon enough to come to the Distinction of *Supreme* and *Subordinate*."

The Word is us'd in a proper Sense, when it is applied either to the Father or the Son. The Son is called G O D, in a proper Sense, because he is the *express Image of the invisible G O D*. We shall see presently, that the Word, G O D, when applied to the Father, signifies some Relation, which *Jehovah* bears to the Creatures. But Christ, the *express Image of G O D*, stands in the same Relation to us, and therefore is called G O D, in the same proper Sense. Yet still, as the Father is Supreme, and the Son Subordinate in that Relation (as will afterward appear) so the Father must be stiled, the most high G O D, or G O D in the highest Sense of the Word; and Christ must be own'd to be G O D in a lower, or subordinate Sense. p. 41.  
p. 35. 47.  
p. 31.

# *Verb. eff. Vox. Relativa, et ad personam  
refertur, Dr. Clarke's 2<sup>d</sup> Reply to Mr.  
Leibnitz p. 51. 3. ab Cited from Newtoni  
Principia, Scholium generale, sub finem.*



The Word, *GOD*, I conceive, is a *relative* Title, even when applied to the Father, and implies not what *Jehovah* is absolutely in himself, but what he is to us, viz. *our GOD*. Yet it does not suppose him to be destitute of his absolute Perfections. Thus, the Word *King*, when applied to *David*, does not directly signify his Personal Qualifications, but his Relation to the *Jews*, and his Authority over them, or the Person invested with that Authority, whatever his other Properties are. Indeed, when we call him *King*, we do not suppose him to be deprived of his Personal Endowments; but at the same time consider him as a wise, valiant, and good King. So when we call *Jehovah GOD*, we do not imagine him to be destitute of his absolute and essential Perfections; but speak of him as an infinitely wise, powerful, and good *GOD*. That is, in other Words, we suppose, that he, who is related to us, as *our GOD*, has absolute Perfections also.

I shall not, at present, inquire what particular Relation the Word, *GOD*, signifies. I do not determine, that it denotes the same as *Creator*, *Governor*, *Adorable*, or any other, in particular. All that I assert, is, that it does signify some *Relation*, and not the *Essence* of *Jehovah*. And, if I prove this, it will be enough for my Purpose.

That the Word, *GOD*, signifies some Relation, which the Person, that is styled so, bears to others, is proved by this Observation, that in Scripture, these *relative* Words, *My*, *Thy*, *Ours*, *His*, &c. are joyn'd to it. Thus it may be properly said, *My GOD*, *Thy GOD*, *Our GOD*, &c. But this could not be, if the Word, *GOD*, did not denote a Relation, which he bears to others. So likewise, we may say, *The GOD of Israel*, *the GOD of Gods*, &c. whereas, if the Word, *GOD*, were a *proper* Name, as *Jehovah* or *Jesus* are, such Expressions would be as improper, as, *My Jehovah*, *The Jehovah of Israel*. Thus we may say, *The Father of the Faithful*; but not, *The Abraham of the Faithful*.

This has been urged by Sir Isaac Newton, Dr. Clarke, and others; and appears convincing. But Dr. Waterland starts an Objection against this Remark, p. 48, 49. in these Words: "I shall only observe, says he, here by the way, that the Word *Star* is a *relative* Word, for

N<sup>o</sup> 35. *Q. Why we may not say, The Jesus of Israel, or the Father of the Faithful?*

Ans. we read that the Name *Jesus* was given for the reason, that he was to be the *Saviour* of his People. *Matth. 1. 21.* — N<sup>o</sup> 42.

" the same Reason with that, which the Doctor gives for  
 " the other. For, the Star of your God Remphan (*Act. viii.*  
 " 43.) is a proper Expression; but in the metaphysical way,  
 " it cannot be said, the luminous Substance of your God  
 " Remphan. So again, Water is a relative Word; for it is  
 " proper to say, the Water of Israel; But in the metaphys-  
 " cal way, it cannot be said, the fluid Substance of Israel,  
 " the Expression is improper. By parity of Reason, we  
 " may make relative Words, almost as many as we please."  
 'Tis surprizing to find a learned Man argue so weakly.  
 The Fallacy, in my Mind, is exceeding obvious. The  
 Doctor says, if it proves the Word, GOD, to be relative,  
 because we may say, the GOD of Israel, then the  
 Words Star and Water must be also relative; because we  
 may say, the Star of Remphan, and the Water of Israel.  
 Surely these Expressions are far enough from being pa-  
 rallel, as will appear from what follows.

Relative Particles, My, Thy, Your, Our, &c. are us'd  
 in two Cases: 1. When the Word, to which they are  
 join'd, signifies a Possession, Property, or Quality.  
 And then the Word, My, for instance, signifies, My Pos-  
 session, My Property, or My Quality. And, in this Case,  
 the Name of the Thing need not be a relative Word.  
 Thus, My House, My Memory are proper Expressions, and  
 signify, that the House is my Possession, my Property,  
 or what I can claim as my own; and the Memory is a  
 Quality or Faculty belonging to me. In these Cases also  
 it is very proper to say, The House of Abraham, or the  
 Memory of Scaliger. For this is no other than, His Mem-  
 ory, His House. And so likewise, when we speak of an  
 Inferior, we may join those Words, My, Thy, &c. to  
 the Name of that Inferior, even tho' it be a proper Name.  
 Thus Abraham might call his Son, My Isaac, and his  
 Servant, My Eliezer. In which Case, I think, Isaac and  
 Eliezer are consider'd as Abraham's Property, or part of  
 what he could claim as his own.

2. The other Case wherein we use the Words, My,  
 Thy, His, &c. is, when they are join'd to a Word that  
 signifies a Superior. As, My King, Your Captain, His  
 Father, &c. In this Case, I imagine, we can never use  
 any other than a relative Word. A proper Name will not  
 stand here. Isaac could not say, My Abraham; tho' he  
 might say, My Father. So we cannot say, Jacob's David;

understood to be a Relative Word, in this  
 manner, as Isaac might say, My God, or yet he  
 might not say, My Father.

*N. B. Property of  
joining Parables  
whenever in  
1st. or 2nd. Case,  
then whether  
the Term itself  
be proper or  
relatives  
G. or as is the  
behaviour of  
H. or*

or the David of Jacob ; tho' we may say, *Jacob's King*, or *the King of Jacob*. In this Case, none but personal Words can be produced as Instances, because none but Persons can be Superiors.

To apply this to our present Purpose. Dr. Waterland's two Instances belong to Case the first. *The Star of Remphan*, or *Remphan's Star*, is that *Star* which belong'd to *Remphan*, as his Property and Representative. *The Water of Israel*, is the *Water* which *Israel* claim'd and possess'd as its own peculiar. But, the *GOD* of *Israel* belongs to Case the second, and must signify One who is related to *Israel*, as its Superior. If the Word, *GOD*, was the proper or absolute Name of the Supreme Being, *The GOD* of *Isaac* would be as improper as *The Abraham of Isaac*. Hence it is exceeding plain, that the Word, *GOD*, expresses some Relation, which *Jehovah* bears to the Creatures, and is not a proper Name, as *Abraham* is. And it appears also, that the learned Doctor's Instances are not parallel to those under the second Case, with which alone we have to do here. So that still Dr. Clarke's Assertion stands good.

- Before I leave this Head, I shall make a Remark on what the Doctor says concerning the two Senses of the Word, *GOD*, viz. when taken essentially or personally. His Words, p. 349, are : " When we say one Person is *GOD*, we mean that he is a *divine Hypostasis*, *Deitatem habens*, as the Schools speak : But when we say *GOD* is three Persons, we understand it of the *divine Essence* or *Substance* ; so that the Word, *GOD*, is sometimes taken essentially, and sometimes personally, which makes the Difference." This Distinction is cunningly enough devised to obviate some Difficulties, which would be otherwise insuperable. However, there are two very great Defects in it, viz. That the Scripture does not reveal it ; and that it is not sufficient to answer the End, for which it was invented. There are but two Senses of the Word here mention'd. Sometimes it is made to signify, a Person having the Divine Nature : At other times, *GOD* is to denote the Divine Essence itself. Let us apply this to particular Expressions, and see what we can make of it. The Word, *GOD*, *John i. 1.* must be understood in the first Sense, and will run thus, *The WORD was with a Person having the Divine Nature, and the WORD*

*GOD*



was a Person having the Divine Nature. So far they are safe enough. But the other Sense is odd: *GOD is three Persons*, that is, *The Divine Essence is three Persons*. For so the Doctor explains the Word, *GOD*. Certainly the Doctor will not defend this Proposition; since he every where distinguishes between the Essence and the Persons. But let us apply this latter Definition of *GOD* to a Text of Scripture. *To Us there is but one GOD, the Father*, according to the Doctor, will run thus, *To Us there is but one Divine Essence, the Father*; which I suppose no Orthodox Man will assert. It cannot therefore be here taken in the latter Sense. And yet, if I am not mistaken, the Doctor would be loth, it should be taken in the other. For, if the Word, *GOD*, be here taken personally, to signify a Person that has the Deity or Divine Nature, St. Paul will teach us, that *to Us there is but one Person that has the Divine Nature, the Father*: Which would quite overturn the Doctor's whole Scheme. It remains then, that the Doctor must find out a third Sense of the Word, *GOD*, if he would successfully defend his Cause.

The Truth is, the Word, *GOD*, is never to be taken otherwise than personally in the Scriptures. The Doctor supposes the contrary, but does not attempt to prove it. And the only Reason which can be urg'd, in my Judgment, is, that otherwise the receiv'd Doctrine cannot be maintain'd. Whereas we have his own Confession that 'tis sometimes us'd personally; and then, he ought to grant, 'tis taken so always, unless he can give a Reason to the contrary. But besides this, we are confirm'd in our Notion, or rather led into it, that it is *always* used personally, because we find, the Scripture every where represents *GOD* as a Person, or as *one* Person. Our Adversaries own, and indeed contend earnestly, that the Words, *We, They, Us, Them, &c.* denote more Persons than one. As when it is said, *Let US make Man: WE will come to him, and make OUR Abode with him, &c.* If this be so, as I never question'd it, must not then the Words, *I, Me, Thou, Thee, He, Him, His, &c.* denote one single Person? Apply this to the present Case. *GOD* says not, *Besides US, there is no GOD*; but *besides ME*. He says, *Thou shalt have no other Gods, before ME*, not, *before US*. Whereas, if our Adversaries Notion were true, it

it would have been thus express'd. But as it is express'd in Scripture, it directly overturns their Opinion. *There is no GOD besides ME the Father*, is intelligible. But *There is no GOD besides ME, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, does not appear so consistent. See this Matter excellently and largely consider'd, in the *Modest Plea*, p. 132—138. whither I refer the Reader.

### III. Of the Unity of GOD.

The Doctrine of the Unity of GOD has afforded the most plausible Objections against Dr. Clarke's Doctrine of the Trinity. This puzzles the common People most. Wherefore, I shall, for their Service, set it in the clearest Light I can. Dr. Clarke, and his Defenders, have hinted at a Solution of 'em; but, I conceive, this Matter may be made plainer to the unlearned Part of the World, than they have condescended to make it.

That I may not be censur'd as concealing the Strength of the Objection, I shall chuse to expose it in the Words of Dr. Waterland, who cannot be supposed to want either Learning or Art to set it off to the best Advantage. He states the Difficulty thus, p. 231. "The Father is GOD, and the Son is GOD, and yet we are no where taught to call them two GODS. The obvious Conclusion from these Premises, is, that they are both one GOD."

1. The Difficulty which every one must perceive in reading the Scriptures, relating to this Matter, is this, There is but one GOD; the Father is GOD; and the Son also is GOD: How then is there but one GOD? There is but one GOD, and yet two distinct Persons are each called God. How shall we clear this from the Charge of a Contradiction?

I am satisfied, the best Method that we can take, in order to solve the Difficulty, is to consider how the Scripture directs us to solve other Difficulties of the like kind; and then to solve this in the same manner. And, if we find that all others are clear'd in one and the same manner, we may be the more confident, that the Difficulty before us must be manag'd the same way. I shall lay before the Reader some parallel Instances, and then apply my Remarks to the Objection before us.

The

p. 22, 32,  
21.

p. 20, 22, 24,  
28, 30, 37,  
38, 50, 51,  
52.

I. The first Difficulty of the like sort relates to the Title of *Savior*. And, that it may appear to be parallel to the other, I shall state it in the same manner as I did that. There is but *one Savior*; *G O D* is a *Savior*; *Othniel* also is a *Savior*. p. 33, 36.

The first Proposition is the Prophet's, *Isaiah xlii. 11. Beside me there is no Savior*: Exactly parallel to *Chap. xlii. 6. Beside me there is no G O D*. That *G O D* is a *Savior*, is asserted in the same Words. And yet others are call'd *Saviors* also. Thus, *Nehem. ix. 27. Thou [Jehovah] gavest them Saviors, who saved them out of the Hand of their Enemies*. Nay, a single Man is call'd a *Savior*, *Judges iii. 9, 15. The Lord raised up a Deliverer [in Hebrew a Savior, as is noted in the Margin] to the Children of Israel, who deliver'd them, even Othniel. Ver. 15. The Lord raised them up a Deliverer [or Savior] Ehad*. Now, if there be no *Savior* besides *G O D*, how is *Othniel* a *Savior*? Surely no one would hence infer, that *G O D* and *Othniel* are *one Savior*. But all Mankind will agree, that *G O D* is the Supreme *Savior*, and *Othniel* his Instrument in the Deliverance. And those Words, *Beside me there is no Savior*, must be understood to exclude only all *co-ordinate, or independent Saviors*; and cannot be supposed to exclude subordinate Saviors, whom the chief *Savior* shall employ as Instruments to bring about the Deliverance. 'Tis evident that these are not excluded, since the Scripture expressly mentions such. And the Texts, in which these subordinate Saviors are mention'd, give us a sufficient Hint how to get over the Difficulty. The Lord gave 'em *Saviors*, and *raised up Saviors*; which shews they were his Deputies. p. 18, 32.

II. Another way of expressing the Unity of *G O D* is by saying, *Thou art G O D alone. Psal. lxxxvi. 10. Isaiah xxxvii. 16. or, The only G O D. John xvii. 3. Jude 25. After the same manner G O D is stiled; The only Potentate. 1 Tim. vi. 15. Yet other Potentates are mention'd, Luke i. 52. He hath put down the Mighty; or as 'tis in the Greek, the Potentates: For the same Word is used in both Places in the Greek, tho' our Translators render'd it by two English Words. And, by the way, I beg once for all, that if the Reader will not take my Word for such Observations, he would ask any learned Man of his Acquaintance;*

C



p. 33, 36.  
 p. 17, 20, 28.  
 p. 38.

tance, from whom he will receive Satisfaction. And when an Adversary agrees with me in such a *Matter of Fact*, an unlearned Reader may be fully satisfied of the Truth of it. For nothing but the plain Truth can be supposed to bring us to an Agreement. But to return; besides this, the Eunuch mention'd *Act. viii.* is call'd a *Potentate*, v. 27. *A Man of Ethiopia, an Eunuch of great Authority under Candace.* In the Greek it runs thus, *An Eunuch a Potentate under Candace.* For 'tis the very same Word as is us'd, where GOD is call'd, *The Potentate.* The Difficulty here is this. GOD is the only Potentate: The *Ethiopian* is a Potentate. But how can he be a Potentate, when GOD is the only Potentate? Certainly no one will say, that the obvious Conclusion from these Premises is, that they are both *one Potentate*. But every one will grant, that when GOD is stiled the only Potentate, it excludes all independent, or equal Potentates only, not such as are subordinate to him, and have derived their Power from him. And the two Propositions must be granted to mean thus much, *GOD is the only supreme Potentate*; the *Ethiopian* is a subordinate Potentate: or, *GOD only is a Potentate in the highest Sense of the Word*; but, in a lower Sense, Others may be call'd Potentates. And the Apostle seems, in this very Place, to hint at this Solution, when he says, *The blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* For he that is King and Lord in the highest Sense, is Potentate also in the highest Sense.

III. *The Lord alone did lead Israel, Deut. xxxii. 12.* yet every Body will grant that *Moses* led them. To reconcile these Expressions, we must say, not that GOD and *Moses* were one Leader; but that GOD was their chief Leader, and *Moses* a subordinate Leader. And thus the Scripture reconciles it, *Psal. lxxvii. 20. Thou leddest thy People like a Flock, by the Hand of Moses and Aaron.*

IV. *St. Jude, v. 4. calls GOD, our only Master or Lord: Denying the only Lord [or Master] GOD.* Men are Masters or Lords, *1 Tim. vi. 1. Let as many Servants, as are under the Yoke, count their own Masters worthy—*. But is it an obvious Conclusion from hence, that GOD and an earthly Master are one Master? On the other hand, will not every one agree, that, when GOD is call'd, the only Master, the meaning is, *GOD is so in the highest Sense of the Word?*

Word? It shews, that there is no Master independent of, and co-ordinate with him. Yet there may be and are, notwithstanding, many Masters in a lower Sense of the Word, that is, many subordinate, or inferior Masters.

V. Again, G O D only is holy, Rev. xv. 4. *Thou only art holy*: And yet a Bishop may be holy. Titus i. 7, 8. *A Bishop must be blameless — just, holy, temperate*. Will any one hence infer, that G O D and a Bishop are one and the same holy Being? Surely we can save this from the Charge of a Contradiction another way, viz. by saying, that G O D alone is holy in the highest Sense of the Word, having an underived Holiness: And that a Bishop is holy in a lower Sense, having only an inferior and derived Holiness. Thus all Mankind would reconcile this seeming Contradiction. And thus Samuel's Mother directs us to understand that Phrase, *G O D only is holy*, when she says, 1 Sam. ii. 2. *There is none holy as the Lord*. Tho' a Bishop be holy, yet he is not holy in the same Sense as the Lord is; and therefore it may be still truly said, *G O D only is holy*.

VI. Another seeming Difficulty or Contradiction of the like sort is this, *G O D only hath Immortality*. 1 Tim. vi. 16. And yet the Bodies of the Saints shall have Immortality, 1 Cor. xv. 53. *This Mortal must put on Immortality*. How shall we reconcile this, but by saying, G O D alone hath Immortality in the highest Sense of the Word, that is, an underiv'd Immortality? Whereas the Immortality of the Bodies of the Saints is derived, and the Gift of G O D.

VII. There is another way of expressing the Unity of G O D, a little different from the former; *Isaiah xlv. 21. There is no G O D else beside me*. But Christ is G O D. Therefore (say our Adversaries) Christ is that same G O D. But let us see how they would argue in a parallel Case. Our Savior says, Matt. xix. 17. *There is none good but one, that is, G O D*. And yet, in the same Gospel, we read of a good Man. xii. 35, *A good Man, out of the good Treasure of the Heart, &c.* And Act. xi. 24. Barnabas is call'd so. Would any one hence conclude, that G O D and Barnabas are one and the same good Being? 'Tis plain this Inference is not just. The only way of reconciling these Expressions, is to say, there is none good in the highest Sense, but G O D, since he alone is

*c* Originally, and of himself, good; whereas Barnabas was good in another, in a lower Sense, as he is good by the Gift and Grace of G O D.

*p. 18, 25* From all these Instances, it is very evident, that the Word *only* excludes no other than Co-ordinates or Equals, not such as are subordinate. They shew us, that when there is a higher and a lower Sense of a Word, the Term *Only* excludes none but such as might be call'd *Saviors, Potentates, Leaders, Masters, Holy, Immortal, Good*, in the highest Sense, but not those, that may be call'd so in a lower Sense. And, I am certain, that no Instance can be produced out of the Bible to the contrary; having consulted every Place, by the help of a *Hebrew* and *Greek* Concordance, wherein such Expressions are used.

*p. 22* I proceed to consider another Phrase, which is used to express the Unity of G O D, and that is, *One G O D*. Thus St. Paul expresses it, *1 Tim. ii. 5. There is one G O D*. And *James ii. 19. Thou believest that there is one G O D, thou dost well*. From hence our Adversaries raise this Argument, There is one G O D; the Father is G O D; the Son is G O D; therefore they two are one G O D. Now that the Reader may see what stress is to be laid on such a way of reasoning, I shall lay before him several like Premises, and observe what Conclusion Men draw from them.

*p. 16* VIII. It is said, *Matt. xxiii. 9. One is your Father, which is in Heaven*. And yet we are requir'd to honour a Man as our Father, *Ephes. vi. 2*. Will any one hence conclude, that G O D, and an earthly Father are one Father? Surely the Truth is, that G O D is our one and only Father, in the principal and highest Sense of the Word; and yet we may also have a Man for a Father in a lower Sense.

*p. 38* IX. G O D is one Lord, *Mark xii. 29. Abraham is a Lord, 1 Pet. iii. 6*. And yet no one would draw this Conclusion, G O D and Abraham are one Lord; but would rather say, G O D is the one Lord in the highest Sense of the Word, and Abraham is a Lord in a lower and subordinate Sense. And we are led to this way of reconciling this seeming Contradiction by what St. Paul says, *1 Tim. vi. 15. where he calls G O D, Lord of Lords*.

X. In the Christian Church there is *One Shepherd*, even Christ *John x. 16. There shall be one Fold, and one Shepherd*.



Yet many are call'd *Shepherds*, or *Pastors*, *Ephes. iv. 11.* And some *Pastors* [or *Shepherds*] and *Teachers*. To reconcile this, we do not say, that *Christ* and *Ministers* are *one Shepherd*, but that *Christ* is the one, or only *Shepherd*, in the highest Sense of the Word; and *Ministers* are *Shepherds* under him: Or, *Christ* is the *great*, or *chief Shepherd*, as he is call'd, *Heb. xiii. 20.* Others are his *Deputies*.

In this manner does every one agree to solve these Difficulties, and to reconcile these seeming Contradictions. And, if there are any others of the like sort, they must be manag'd thus also. I know not one, that any Body would reconcile in the same way, as some do that, wherein the Father is said to be the one, or only *GOD*, and the Son also to be *GOD*. I ask then, if all parallel Difficulties are universally solv'd by supposing there are two Senses of the Word, a higher and a lower, why should not this be solv'd in the same manner? Why should we say that the obvious Conclusion from these Premises is this, *The Father and Son are one GOD*, any more than that the obvious Conclusions from the other Premises of the like sort, are, that *GOD* and *Othniel* are *one Savior*, that *GOD* and the *Ethiopian Eunuch* are *one Potentate*, that *GOD* and *Abraham* are *one Father*, or *one Lord*, that *Christ* and a *Minister* are *one Pastor*, &c? Why should this Matter be explain'd in a different way from all the rest? Why should this be excepted from the general Method of reconciling all seeming Contradictions of this kind? Upon the whole, I hope, the Reader will see it reasonable, with me, to take the same Method in all these Cases. And, since the Scripture never gives one Instance of drawing such a Conclusion as *Dr. Waterland* does, from such Premises, I should think, no one would imagine, that That is the proper Conclusion. 'Tis not the way of reasoning, which the Scripture, but which the School-men have taught. The Premises are,

*There is but one GOD; The Father is GOD; Christ is GOD.*

*Dr. Waterland*, without being able to produce one Instance, from Scripture, of drawing such an Inference, in any parallel Case, makes this Conclusion, viz. *The Father and the Son are one GOD.* My Conclusion from the same Premises

*c 17 p 38  
1 p 22*  
Premises is, that the Father is GOD in the *highest Sense* of the Word, and the Son is GOD in a *lower and subordinate Sense*; being, as the *Nicene Creed* expresses it, God of GOD. And I have justified my concluding in this manner, from hence, that all the World makes the like Conclusion in all other like Cases. And I beg the Reader to take Notice, that the Instances, which I have produced, are full to the purpose, and are answerable to the strongest Expressions in the present Objection.

*p.*  
But before I leave this Head, I must observe, that there is one thing more in which these Instances are parallel to the Difficulty before us; and that is, that the Father is every where said to be the one GOD, or the only GOD, even as (in my Instances) GOD is call'd the only Savior, the only Potentate, the one Father, the one Lord, only holy, only good, only immortal, at the same time, that others have these Titles given to them. So, if we look into the Scripture, we find, that the one GOD is described to be One Person, not two Persons [See before p. 15.] and is said to be the Father, not Father and Son together. Thus, *To us there is but one GOD, the Father. GOD, even the Father, &c.*

*a p.*  
Put all these Considerations together, and, I think, it amounts to a Demonstration, that the Doctor's Conclusion is not the true Inference from the Premises, but that ours is, viz. That the Father is the supreme GOD, and that the Son is so GOD, as that he has a GOD above him.

*p. 20.  
16. v. 2.*  
The Difficulty relating to the Unity of GOD, when it is said, *There is but one GOD*, has been consider'd. But there is still another way of expressing this Difficulty; and that is,

*The Father is GOD; and the Son is GOD. Waterl.*

*p. 331.*

*p. 30, 40, 50.  
a p.  
p. 16.  
p. 35.*  
To solve this, which appears to assert two Gods, Dr. Waterland says, *That they are both one GOD*; and that this is the obvious Conclusion to be drawn from these Premises. I, on the contrary, think, that these two Propositions can and must be reconciled another way, even by saying, that the Father is the supreme GOD; and the Son is GOD in a *subordinate Sense* of the Word. See the following Instances of the like Difficulties.

**XI. God**

XI. GOD was King of Judah; Hezekiah was King of Judah. The former Proposition is express'd, *Isaiah xliii. 15. The Creator of Israel, your King.* That Hezekiah was at that time King of Judah will not be denied. Yet see *Isai. xxxix. and xxxviii. 9.* But would any one hence conclude, that GOD and Hezekiah were one King? Will not all own that another method must be taken to reconcile these seemingly contrary Passages, even by saying, that GOD was King in the highest Sense, and Hezekiah subordinate to him? And tho' the Scripture does not, as far as I remember, expressly mention this Distinction of the Word King, into Supreme and Subordinate; yet, every one will agree, that common Sense teaches us to make it.

XII. GOD saved Israel. Gideon saved Israel. Thus we read, *Judg. vi. 14. Thou [Gideon] shalt save Israel.* The Scripture does not solve this, by saying, GOD and Gideon are one Savior; but GOD will save by Gideon, v. 36, 37. *Thou [GOD] wilt save Israel by mine Hand.* That is, GOD saved them, not immediately, but by Gideon, his Instrument and Deputy.

XIII. Pharaoh was Ruler of Egypt; Joseph was, at the same time, Ruler of Egypt, as the Psalmist says, *Psal. cv. 20, 21. The King [Pharaoh] sent and loosed him [Joseph] even the Ruler of the People, and let him go free. He made him Lord of his House, and Ruler of all his Substance.* Yet who ever call'd Pharaoh and Joseph, one Ruler? Should we not rather say, that Pharaoh was chief Ruler, and Joseph subordinate to him? Nay, the very Words of the Text direct us to this Solution; *He made him Lord and Ruler.* Joseph is said, *Gen. xlv. 8, 26, to be Ruler over all the Land of Egypt.* And we have a full Account and Solution of this Matter, *Gen. xli. 39, 40. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph—Thou shalt be over my House, and according unto thy Word shall all my People be ruled; only in the Throne will I be greater than Thou.* These last Words plainly shew that Pharaoh is called, Ruler, in a higher Sense of the Word, and Joseph in a lower or subordinate Sense. I intreat the Reader to take particular Notice of this Instance, and to remember, that Pharaoh and Joseph were both of the same humane Nature, and equal, as Men; and that ALL the Subjects of Pharaoh were the Subjects of Joseph; *According to thy Word shall ALL my People be ruled.* And yet they were not two independent Rulers, nor one Ruler;



Proper

[ 24 ]

Ruler; but Pharaoh was the one and only Ruler, and Joseph his Deputy.

XIV. GOD made Joseph Ruler: Pharaoh made him Ruler, Gen. xlv. 8. *It was not you that sent me hither, but GOD; and HE hath made me a Father to Pharaoh—and a Ruler throughout all the Land of Egypt.* And yet in the forecited cv<sup>th</sup> Psalm, 'tis said, *Pharaoh made him Ruler; not that GOD and Pharaoh were one Maker; but GOD had the chief Hand in it, and Pharaoh was his Instrument.*

XV. Jehovah sent the Spies into Canaan, Deut. ix. 23. Moses sent them; Numb. xiii. 17. Shall we hence infer, that Jehovah and Moses are one Being? No one, without inquiring any farther; will stick to say, that GOD sent em by Moses. This is the obvious Conclusion. And accordingly thus does the Scripture solve the Difficulty; Numb. xiii. 3. Moses by the Commandment of the Lord sent them. GOD was the principal Sender, and Moses his Agent.

XVI. Christ is the Apostle, Heb. iii. 1. Paul is an Apostle. And yet they are not one Apostle. But Christ is the chief Apostle; and there is no other Apostle besides him, in that high Sense, in which he is called so: Paul is a subordinate Apostle.

XVII. Jesus baptized Disciples; John iv. 1. His Disciples baptized the very same Persons, v. 2. To reconcile these seeming Contradictions, we must say, that Jesus was the chief Minister of Baptism, and the Disciples were his Deputies; or, that Christ baptized by them; that is, they baptized by Virtue of a Commission from him. And 'tis clear, that this is the meaning of the Place; since it is said, *Jesus — baptized — tho' Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples.* That is, Jesus did not immediately baptize with his own Hands, but he did it by the Ministry of his Apostles.

This shews that what Dr. Waterland calls the obvious Conclusion, is wholly unwarranted by all other parallel Instances. And these give one sufficient Reason to think, that we ought not to draw a like Conclusion from like Premises, even when the Father and Son are spoken of.

But this is not all (tho' I think it would be enough, if there were no more :) For the Scripture always draws  
our

our Conclusion, not his, from such Premises in which the Father and Son are spoken of expressly. I will gladly put the Controversy upon this Issue. If our Lord and his Apostles infer'd Dr. *Waterland's* Conclusion from Dr. *Waterland's* Premises, I will readily own, that his Conclusion is just. But, if it shall be made to appear, that Christ and his Apostles *always*, when they drew any Consequence at all, drew the same as I do from those Premises; then I would hope, that the Doctor and his Friends will argue in the same manner. I am sure, Christ and the inspir'd Writers of the New Testament better understood how to draw Consequences from divine Revelations, than we do. To their Judgment every Christian ought to submit, and their Example we may safely follow. Whereas, if we, by our shallow Reason, draw a Consequence, in Matters of Revelation, which they never drew; we are not out of danger of being deceived. Let us see then, how they argued from Christ's having the same Titles and Works ascrib'd to him, as are also ascrib'd to the Father. And, I am sure, they never hence infer'd, that the Father and Son are one GOD; but always, that Christ is *subordinate* to the Father in those Titles and Works.

*Scripture  
Consequences  
of Rule to  
Direct us*

I. The Father is our Savior, *Titus* iii. 4. *The Kindness and Love of GOD, our Savior.* Jesus Christ is our Savior, *v. 6. Thro' Jesus Christ our Savior.* Does the Apostle infer from hence, That GOD and Christ are one Savior? No, he reconciles the seeming Contradiction, by saying, that GOD is our Savior, *thro' Christ our Savior.* And he expressly says, that *God our Savior* — *Saves us by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, whom he shed on us abundantly, thro' Jesus Christ our Savior.* The Father saves us, not immediately by himself, but by the Mediation of Christ, whom he sent to be our immediate Savior. So that GOD is call'd our Savior, in the highest Sense of the Word; as it imports one, who originally contrived and appointed the Means and Method of our Salvation. And Christ is called our Savior in a lower Sense, as he is the Person appointed and sent by the Father immediately to do the Work.

*p. 20, 26, 39.*

II. The Father is Lord, *Matt.* xi. 25. *I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth.* Christ is Lord, *Act.* vii. 59. *Lord Jesus receive my Spirit.* But does the Scrip-

ture teach us to infer from hence, that the Father and Son are *one Lord*? Does it not evidently direct us to another sort of Conclusion? *Act. ii. 36. GOD hath made Jesus — both Lord and Christ.* So that 'tis plain the Word *Lord* is taken in a higher and in a lower Sense. When applied to the Father, it signifies one who is originally and of himself Lord. But when applied to Christ, it denotes a subordinate Lord, who was made such by the other.

III. The Father did the miraculous Works which confirm'd the Gospel, *John xiv. 10. The Father that dwelleth in me, He doth the Works.* The Son did the same Works, *v. 12. He that believeth on me, the Works that I do, shall he do also, and greater Works than these shall he do.* Neither our Savior, nor his Apostles, draw such a Conclusion from these Passages, as *Dr. Waterland* would, *viz. That the Father and Son are one Worker of Miracles.* But *St. Peter* reconciles these Propositions, by saying *Act. ii. 22. that Jesus was approved of GOD by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, which GOD did by him:* And since *GOD* did 'em by Christ, they might justly and properly be said to be done by either. *GOD*, even the Father, was the original Worker, tho' Christ was the immediate and subordinate Instrument in working them. I would only farther observe here, by the way, that Christ's Disciples were to do greater Works than his: And then surely the Greatness of his Works do not prove him to be the supreme GOD.

IV. *GOD* created all things, *Gen. i. 1.* Christ created all things, *John i. 3.* *Dr. Waterland* says upon this, *p. 331. Yet we have no Warrant to say Two Creators.* This, I own, is most certainly true. For these Words, *Two Creators*, must mean Two, who are Creators in the same highest Sense of the Word. But, to be sure, the learned Doctor thought, it might be hence infer'd, that they are *one Creator*; even as from like Premises he infers, that they are *one GOD*. But I cannot find, that the Scriptures ever take this Method to reconcile these seeming contradictory Propositions. On the contrary, *St. Paul* reconciles 'em, as I have done all of the like Nature, by saying, *Ephes. iii. 9. GOD who created all things by Jesus Christ.* That is, *GOD* is the primary Creator, and Christ is his Instrument in Creation; or, *GOD* gave him an Ability and a Command to create the World.

V. It



V. It is GOD that justifieth, Rom. viii. 33. We are justified by Christ, Gal. ii. 17. Does the Apostle infer from hence, that GOD and Christ are one Justifier, or that Christ is that GOD who justified? If he does, 'tis more than I have found. But I am sure, he solves this Difficulty, by saying, Rom. iii. 24. We are justified freely by his [God's] Grace, thro' the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, That is, GOD is our Justifier, in the highest Sense of the Word; as all Pardon comes originally from him: And Christ is our Justifier in a lower Sense, as he has received the Gift of an Authority to pardon us; according to what the Apostle says, Act. v. 31. Him hath GOD exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, to give Repentance to Israel, and Forgiveness of Sins.

VI. GOD only forgives Sin, Mark ii. 7. The Son of Man forgives Sin, ~~Rom. i. 4.~~ And the Apostles forgive Sin, John xx. 23. *Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.* Will any one hence infer, that the Son of Man and the Apostles are the supreme GOD? I am sure the Scripture warrants no such Conclusion. There we are taught to reconcile these seeming Contradictions, thus; GOD alone has an underived and supreme Right to forgive Sins, and none, but those that he impowers, can do it. But the Son of Man received a Commission from GOD to forgive Sin, and so acted as GOD's Minister in this Affair. This our Savior teaches us, in those Words, Mark ii. 10. But that ye may know, that the Son of Man hath Power on Earth to forgive Sins, &c. Where surely, he does not mean an underived Power, but a Commission given to him by GOD.

VII. The Father shall be Judge of all, Heb. xii. 23. And to GOD the Judge of all, 1 Pet. i. 17. Call on the Father, who — judgeth according to every Man's Work, Christ shall be Judge of Quick and Dead, Act. x. 42. How shall we reconcile these things? How can each of these divine Persons be call'd Judge? Dr. Waterland would answer, that the Father and Son are the one Judge. But the Scripture never gives us this Solution. It supposes the Father alone to be the one Judge; because he alone is the supreme Judge; and Christ is Judge in a lower and subordinate Sense, as being appointed and commission'd to judge in his Father's Name. Thus we are told, Rom. ii. 16. GOD shall judge the Secrets of Men by Jesus Christ. And

*at 18, 30.*  
 Act. xvii. 31. GOD hath appointed a Day wherein he will judge the World — by that Man whom he hath ordained. The Son is Judge, because the Father hath given him Authority to execute Judgment, John v. 27. So that the Father is Judge, and the Son is Judge, and yet there is but one Judge, in the highest Sense of the Word, even the Father. And the Son is not another Judge independent on him, but is a subordinate Judge ordained and authorized to judge under the Father. That this is the Scripture-way of solving this Difficulty, is clear from the Texts already cited. Yet still it may be confirm'd from two farther Observations. (1) It is said, 1 Pet. i. 17. That the Father judgeth according to every Man's Work. And yet we read, John v. 22. The Father judgeth no Man. These Expressions can be no otherwise reconcil'd, than by saying, That the Word, Judge, does not in both Places signify the same sort of judging; or that there is a higher and a lower Sense of the Word. When it is said, The Father does not judge; the obvious Meaning is, that He does not judge immediately by himself, or that He is not the immediate Judge. But, when 'tis said, that the Father doth judge, it is plainly meant, that he is supreme in the Judgment, as judging by the Son, whom he has appointed to be the immediate Judge. Whence we learn, that the Father only is Judge in the highest Sense of the Word, and Christ in a lower. (2.) I observe, to confirm this, that we may as well prove, by Dr. Waterland's way of arguing, that Christ and the Saints are one Judge. For, Christ shall judge the World: The Saints shall judge the World, 1 Cor. vi. 2. Matt. xix. 28. Whereas all Mankind will agree, that here the Word Judge is taken in a higher Sense, when spoken of Christ, and in a lower and subordinate Sense, when spoken of the Saints. And this is the only way to reconcile this seeming Contradiction. And, if we shall not stick to assert, that the Word, Judge, in this Case, is taken in two different Respects, even tho' the Scripture does no where, as I know, expressly say so: How much more may we be positive of it, in the other Case? Since not only the common use of Words directs us thus to understand 'em, but also the holy Scripture expressly teaches us, that GOD judgeth by Christ; that is, that GOD is the supreme Judge, and Christ the subordinate.

VIII. *The Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them: And the Son quickeneth whom he will, John v. 21.* Now, what doth the Scripture infer from hence? Does it say, *The obvious Conclusion from these Premises is, that they both are one Quickner?* If it does, 'tis more than I know. But I am sure, our blessed Lord himself solves this Difficulty another way, viz. by saying, v. 26. *The Father — hath GIVEN to the Son to have Life in himself; that is, hath given him Power to raise the Dead; as that Phrase plainly signifies, according to the unanimous Judgment of Commentators.* And so, the Father is the Raiser of the Dead, in the highest Sense of the Phrase, as it signifies one who received not that Power from another, and in which Sense he might be call'd, *The only Raiser*; whereas the Son is a Quickner in a lower Sense, as he quickens *under the Father* by a Power derived from, and given by him.

IX. *GOD the Father raised Christ from the Dead, Gal. i. 1.* Christ raised himself. *John x. 17, 18. I lay down my Life — and I have Power to take it again.* Does Christ design hereby to teach us, that they both are one Raiser of Christ's Body? Nay, does not our Lord expressly give us another Solution of the Difficulty, in the very next Words? *This Commandment have I received of my Father.* And since Christ rais'd his Body by a Power received from his Father; his Father, who gave him that Power, may properly be said to raise it; tho' not immediately, as Christ did. Nay, the Father may be said *alone* to raise it; since he alone could raise it, by an undervived Power, and was the alone Original of that Power, by which it was raised.

X. *GOD hath reconciled us to himself, 2 Cor. v. 18.* Christ hath reconciled us to *GOD*, *Ephes. ii. 16.* But doth the Scripture hence infer, that Christ is the supreme *GOD*, or one Being with the Father? No, St. Paul solved the Difficulty by saying, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19. *All things are of GOD, who hath reconciled us to himself BY Jesus Christ — GOD was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself.* That is, *GOD the Father* reconciles us, as the supreme *GOD*, and Christ as the *Mediator* under him.

XI. *The Father is over all.* This will not be disputed. Christ is over all, being *Head over all things to the Church, Ephes. i. 22.* The Scripture does not teach us  
to



to infer from hence, that the Father and Son are the one GOD; but solves the Difficulty by saying, v. 17, 22. That the GOD of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory — hath put all things under his Feet, and GAVE him to be the Head over all, &c. So that the Father is the Supreme Head over all, being the Head, and the GOD of Christ himself; whereas Christ is only Head of the whole Creation, and made so too; and is not above the Father. For, as the Apostle observes, 1 Cor. xv. 27. It is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.

Thus the Reader may see, how the Scripture does, and consequently how we ought, to reconcile seeming Contradictions of this Nature. Not one, of all that I have mention'd, is to be reconcil'd in the manner in which Dr. Waterland attempts to reconcile that before us, viz. The Father is GOD; the Son is God; therefore they are one GOD. But on the contrary, if we would solve this, as we do all others of this Nature, we must do it thus, The Father is GOD, in the highest Sense of the Word: The Son is GOD in a lower Sense. And then, I am sure, it will be no Contradiction to this to add, Yet there is but one GOD in the highest Sense of the Word, even the Father. If the Reader has carefully observ'd the foregoing parallel Instances, he will see, that all the Difficulties in them, without one Exception, are solv'd by the help of such a Distinction of the Sense of a Word into a higher and a lower Sense. And then, why should not the same Distinction be applied here also, since this Difficulty is exactly parallel to those? I believe that the learned Doctor cannot produce one single Instance of a parallel Difficulty solv'd his way: Whereas I have produc'd twenty-eight, wherein the like Difficulties are solv'd my way. Whence, I think, it is a Demonstration, that this Difficulty must be solv'd the same way, with all the rest of this sort; that is, by saying, the Father, and He alone, is GOD in the highest Sense of the Word, and Christ is God subordinate to him; even as Pharaoh was supreme Ruler of Egypt, and Joseph a subordinate Ruler of it.

This, one would think, should be sufficient to determine the Point, beyond Controversy. However, for the

fuller Conviction of the Reader, I shall proceed directly

The Word, GOD, is to prove, that the Word, GOD, (like the Words, Saviour, Potentate,

taken, &c. in Scripture, in a higher sense, &c. apply'd to the Father, &c. in a lower sense, &c. to the Son

N. 28, 38

N. 22, 21, 26.  
N. 36.

N. 21.

N. 35.

Potentate, Father, Lord, Judge, Creator, &c.) is, in this  
 very Case, taken in a higher Sense, when applied to the  
 Father, and in a lower Sense, when applied to the Son.  
 That it is used in a very low Sense, when it is applied to  
 Angels or Magistrates, cannot be question'd by any, and  
 therefore needs no Proof. And that it is, when applied  
 to the Son, used (tho' in a much higher Sense than when  
 Angels are call'd Gods, yet) in a lower Sense than when  
 the Father is call'd GOD, appears from Heb. i. 8, 9. Unto  
 the Son he saith, *Thy Throne, O GOD, is for ever and*  
*ever — GOD, even THY GOD hath anointed thee.*  
 Here the Son is call'd *God*; and yet the Father is stiled  
*his* GOD: Which, in other Words, is this, The Father is  
 the GOD of God the Son; that is, the Father is GOD  
 in a higher Sense than the Son. The Son, indeed, is  
 God of the whole Creation. But the Father is the  
 GOD, not only of the whole Creation, but of the Son  
 too. When the Father is called GOD, the Word, GOD,  
 signifies one absolutely supreme over all Persons whatso-  
 ever, without Exception: But, when the Son is call'd  
 GOD, it means a Person, who is exalted above all Crea-  
 tures, tho' still subordinate to the Father. For, as the  
 Words now cited testify, the Son, even as GOD, has a  
 GOD above him, to be his GOD. And, tho' we do not,  
 as I can remember, find in Scripture the Expression,  
supreme GOD; yet we have there what is exactly of the  
 same Signification, in plainer English, viz, The most high  
GOD, and Highest. The Father is call'd, the most high  
 GOD, Heb. vii. 1, and The Highest, Luke i. 32. For if  
 Christ be the Son of the Highest, then the Father is the  
Highest; that is, in other Words, the supreme GOD. This,  
 I think, compleats the Demonstration, that the Word,  
 GOD, when applied to the Father, is taken in the  
 highest Sense; but when applied to the Son, is taken in  
 a lower and subordinate Sense.

From what has been said, it is clear how there is but  
 one GOD, tho' Christ be call'd GOD as well as the Fa-  
 ther. For, when the Scripture says, *There is but one*  
*GOD*, it evidently means, that there is but one GOD in  
 the highest Sense of the Word. Thus we are obliged  
 to interpret all parallel Expressions, as the Reader could  
 not but observe when I mention'd particular Instances.  
 And thus we are consistent with those Expressions of  
 Hcly

*in Longhura*  
*p. 35.*

*p. 26, 33, 36.*

*p. 37, 34,*  
*231*  
*11.*

Holy Scripture, which declare, that *The Father is the only true GOD, the one GOD, the Great GOD, &c.* Whereas, Dr. Waterland's Conclusion is not to be reconciled with these Expressions of Scripture. He infers, that *The Father and Son are one GOD!* The Scripture never says so; but always speaks of the Supreme GOD as *one Person*, and calls him, *The Father*.

3. But after all that has been said, it may be urged, 'That this Scheme plainly makes *two GODS*; and makes Christ to be *another GOD* distinct from the Father; which is certainly contrary to Reason and Scripture! This is the only remaining Difficulty relating to the Unity of GOD: And when this is clear'd up, the Controversy will be ended. In order hereto I shall consider the meaning of these Expressions, *Two GODS*, and, *Another GOD*.

I think it is very plain, that the Phrase, *Two GODS*, signifies, Two Supreme, Independent GODS; or, *Two who are GODS in the higher Sense of the Word*. This is proved by three Arguments. 1. This is the meaning of all the like Expressions. Thus, *Two Masters*, are two Coordinate, or Independent Masters. In this Sense our Lord uses these Words; *Matth. 6. 24. No Man can serve Two Masters: For he will either hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve GOD and Mammon.* It is obvious upon the least Thought, that our Savior does not mean, by *Two Masters*, a Supreme and a Subordinate Master. For a Servant may well be subject to, and obey, one Supreme and one Subordinate Master. *Onesimus* might be a Servant to GOD, and to *Pbilemon* at the same time. And yet, according to our Saviour's Maxim, he could not serve *two Masters*. It is plain then, that a Supreme Master, and a Subordinate Master are not *two Masters*. *Two Masters* are such as are Independent on each other; as Christ fairly hints, by instancing in *God and Mammon*. *Mammon* is not GOD's Deputy, but Enemy and Rival; and commands the directly contrary to what GOD does. And 'tis undoubtedly impossible to serve two such Masters.

2. Again, *two Kings*, signifies, Two coordinate and independent Kings. *Deut. iii. 2, 3, 8. Sibon and Og, are called two Kings; the one, King of Bashan; the other, King of Heshbon; being independent on each other, or two coordinate Kings; like the King of England, and the King of France: Neither of whom*

N. 40,  
39

N. 54, 16, 18  
26, 34  
N. 51

Two GODS signifies  
Two in the higher  
sense of the Word

N. 17, 51. a



*Dr. J. J. Cluth's Reply p. 9, 10 - He instead of  
King or Kings, reads Ruler or Rulers, & in his Instance  
of Pharaoh &c. - [ 33 ] Joseph - as also here p. 23, 24.*

whom owed his Authority to the other; or acknowledged the other as his Superior. Whereas a Sovereign King, and a Subordinate King, such as David and Solomon, Pharaoh, and Joseph, are never call'd, two Kings. And, I believe, the Dr. would not think it proper to call King George, and the Duke of Bolton, two Kings, let his Authority in Ireland be ever so great, provided, he is still the King's Lieutenant, and not his equal. Agreeably hereto, Two Gods, must signify two Supreme Gods.

2. Since One Savior, One Master, One Potentate, One Father, One Lord, One Shepherd, &c. signify, One Supreme Savior, Potentate, Master, &c. as has been already shewn; then, Two Saviors, Two Masters, Two Potentates, Two Fathers, &c. must denote two Supreme Saviors, Potentates, Masters, &c. And, in like manner, as, One G O D, has been proved to signify One Supreme G O D: So, Two G O D S must necessarily signify, Two Supreme G O D S.

3. The Words themselves shew this. When we say, Two Masters, for Instance, we must mean, Two Persons, who are Masters in the same high Sense of the Word. For when the Word, Masters, is express'd, as it is in this Case, but once, it cannot possibly be supposed to denote, at once, both the higher and the lower Sense of that Word. To do this, it must be used twice; as, for instance, a Master, and a Master; or, G O D is his Master, and Philemon is his Master. So likewise, the Expression, Two G O D S, must signify Two who are G O D S in the same Supreme Sense of the Word. For the Word G O D, used but once, as in this Case, cannot at the same time express both the Supreme and the Subordinate Sense of the Word. To do this, the Word, G O D, must be repeated; as in this Instance, The Word was with G O D, and the Word was G O D: Where the former is the Supreme G O D, the Father; the latter, a G O D in a Subordinate Sense, even the Son. I conclude then, that the Expression, Two G O D S, signifies Two Persons, or Beings, each of which is G O D in the same highest Sense of the Word.

If we apply this to what Dr. Waterland says upon this Head, it will be obvious at first sight, that it is mere Quibble, and Mistake. He, in many Places, represents Dr. Clarke, and his Friends as asserting Two G O D S. To which they answer, that they do not assert two G O D S; since they do not hold the Father and Son to be each G O D in the same high Sense of the Word. This the Dr.

owns, they do not, p. 81. "I do not charge you with  
 "asserting two Supreme GODS." Then I am sure, we  
 do not assert two GODS. (Since Two GODS and two  
Supreme GODS, are all one.) Yea, on the contrary, we  
 most earnestly contend, that there is but one Supreme  
 GOD. But still Dr. Waterland will have us believe that  
 we hold two GODS. "I do charge you (says he) with  
 holding two GODS, one Supreme, another Inferior.  
 This is inaccurately express'd. For I have proved, that  
 Two GODS are two Supreme GODS. But surely a  
Supreme and an Inferior are not two Supreme GODS.  
 And I have before assign'd the Reasons why they cannot  
 be so call'd. Indeed, the Dr. is pleas'd to tell us, with-  
 out attempting to prove it, that he insist upon it, That a  
 great King, and a little King make two Kings, or else one  
 of them is no King, contrary to the Supposition. The  
 same he says of a Supreme and a Subordinate God, that they  
 make two Gods, or else one of them is no GOD, contrary  
 to the Supposition. p. 88, 89. If by two Kings he  
 means (as all Mankind else does) two Supreme, Co-ordinate  
 Kings; his Assertion will be this, viz. A Supreme King  
 and a Subordinate King make two Supreme Kings; which is  
 an express Contradiction. But if, by Two Kings, he  
 means a Supreme King and a Subordinate King under him;  
 then his Proposition will stand thus, a Supreme King, and  
 a Subordinate King, make a Supreme King and a Subordinate  
 King; which is indeed very true, but nothing to the  
 Doctor's purpose. So, if by Two GODS he means a  
Supreme and a Subordinate GOD, his Assertion will  
 amount to no more than this trifling Proposition, viz. A  
Supreme GOD, and a Subordinate GOD make a Supreme  
 GOD and a Subordinate GOD. But I insist upon it,  
 that a Supreme GOD, and a Subordinate GOD are not  
 two GODS, as I have already proved; for two GODS  
 necessarily signifies, Two Supreme GODS.

I go on with the Learned Doctor. He asks, p. 75. Where  
 does the Scripture give you the least Intimation of two true  
 Gods? I own, it never does give us the least intimation  
 of two true GODS, but always supposes and asserts that  
 there is but one. And let it be observed, that this true  
 GOD is always represented in Scripture, as but one sin-  
 gle Person, even the Father of Christ. Christ calls his  
 Father, the only true GOD, John 17. 3. This is Life Eternal,

# There seem to be a Tally in Greek & Heb.: For  
 where up Pow'd are alike, there is Power, there is  
 neither Great, nor Little, No never less there be  
Great & Little wth respect to Extent of Empire

1628  
p. 32, 37

N. 36 #

N. 33.

N. 28, 31.

N. 40.

that they might know Thee [the Father] the only true G O D, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. Again, 1 John v. 20. And we know, that the Son of G O D is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true [on the true G O D] and we are in him that is true, through his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true G O D and Eternal Life. I read it, Through his Son, as the old Translation used in the Church of England did, and as is most agreeable to the Original. Let the Reader take Notice of those words, His Son Jesus Christ; and it will be evident that the Father is here call'd, The true G O D. Christ is styled, His Son. I ask then, Whose Son is he? Is he not the Son of the true G O D, or of him that is true? The true G O D here mention'd, is one that has a Son, and then it is plain, that the Father of Christ, not Christ himself, is call'd the true G O D. And thus it appears, that these Words are exactly parallel to that Passage in our Lords Prayer, just now quoted. For in both we are told, that he, whose Son Christ is, is the true G O D, and that it is eternal Life to know this true G O D, and his Son, Jesus Christ. But Christ is never call'd the true G O D, in Scripture. Indeed, he is truly God, and call'd so in a proper Sense, viz. because he truly bears the same Relation to us, as the Father does, upon the Account of which he is call'd, G O D: Yet still, being Subordinate to the Father in that Relation and Title, the Father is the only true G O D. Where (says Doctor W.) does the Scripture furnish you with any Ground for the Distinction of a Sovereign, and an Inferior Deity? Every Reader will see how to answer this Question, if we first apply it to a parallel Case. I before observed p. 23. that Pharaoh was Ruler of Egypt, and Joseph was Ruler of Egypt, and that all are agreed, in calling Pharaoh, Supreme Ruler, and Joseph an Inferior Ruler. I ask then, Where does the Scripture furnish you with any ground for the Distinction of a Sovereign, and an Inferior Ruler? It is easily answer'd, that tho' the Scripture does not use these very Terms, Sovereign and Inferior, in signifying the Distinction; yet it expresses it in other Words, which convey the very same meaning. And common Sense teaches us to understand the Word Ruler, thus differently in the two Propositions. So, likewise, I have before proved, that the Word G O D is taken sometimes in a higher,

p. 11, 12.

p. 23, 30  
36, 33p. 23, 37  
p. 224, 31.



higher, at other times in a lower Sense. Again, says the Dr. What Foundation can you find for adding Supreme, where-ever the Scripture says absolutely, there is but one GOD? I have shewn already what Foundation there is for it. The Scripture says, There is but One Father, but One Lord, but One Savior, but one Master, &c. These Expressions, (as is granted by all) signify, one Supreme Father, Lord, Savior, &c. I ask then, in my turn, What Foundation can you find for adding, Supreme, where ever the Scripture says absolutely, there is but one Father, Master, &c. And the same Answer which Dr. Waterland will give to my Question, I will return to his. The Cases are exactly parallel; and so the answer to one, will be the answer to the other. For, in all these Cases, Common Sense directs us to add the Word, Supreme, that we may avoid a Contradiction. And, if we must add the word, Supreme, in all the parallel Instances, it cannot be doubted, but that it must be added also when we say, there is but one GOD. The Reader will please to take Notice, that all Dr. Waterland's Banter in this Case, might be turn'd upon the other Instances; which would not then appear witty, nor perhaps innocent. And I would seriously intreat every Christian not to imitate the Doctor in this Ridicule, lest it be found to be Bantering the Scriptures in this Instance, as it would be undoubtedly in all the parallel ones, before mention'd.

I was surpriz'd to find Dr. Waterland assert, that a Sovereign and an Inferior King may be call'd in a proper way of speaking, Two Kings. Since both in studied and common Discourse, this Phrase always signifies two Sovereign Kings; as I have proved, it necessarily must. And, I dare say, that no Writer whatever, in expressing his own thoughts, ever meant otherwise. I am sure, the Scripture does not, in any Case whatever, mean, by Two, one Supreme, and one Subordinate. The King of England, and the King of France are indeed two Kings, being both Sovereign, and Independent. But the King of England, and a Regent (let his Authority be ever so high and extensive, under him) are not two Kings: But the former is The King, the latter A King. The Dr. says, p. 88. 'If they are not Two Kings, one of them is no King.' Apply this way of talking to the Case of Pharaoh and Joseph before mentioned; and it will appear directly to contradict the

the Scripture. If they are not two Rulers, then one of *em* is no Ruler. It has been demonstrated, that 'tis improper to call them two Rulers: And yet 'tis false, that Joseph was no Ruler. For he is expressly called so. So likewise, tho' the Father and Son are not two Gods, as undoubtedly they are not, yet 'tis false, that the Son is no God: For he is expressly call'd G O D. If the Reader will carefully review the many parallel Instances, which I have produced, and consider how all Men reason with regard to them, he will see no difficulty in the present Case.

I know of but one turn more, that the Doctor has to puzzle this Cause: And that is, That if the Son be not the same G O D with the Father, and yet be G O D, he must of necessity be another G O D. On this I remark, I do not believe the Son to be the same individual Being with the Father (which the Dr. means, when he calls them one G O D.) However, I not only grant, but even contend for it, that the Son is G O D. Yet still I deny, that he is another G O D, in the proper Sense of that Phrase. For I am satisfied, that the Expression, Another G O D, signifies another Supreme G O D. To confute this, the Dr. observes, p. 4. That you have not the least Ground or Reason for putting this Sense upon the Text. It is not said, there is no other Supreme G O D beside me; but absolutely, no other. The Reader will easily discern the Weakness of this Observation, by applying it to any of the foregoing parallel Instances. I shall apply it only to one of 'em, for a Sample, and leave the Reader to apply it to the rest. Othniel is expressly call'd a Savior. And yet G O D says, Beside me there is no Savior. Here the Dr. will agree with me, in interpreting these Words thus, There is no other Supreme Savior. Suppose it should be objected, The Text does not say so, but absolutely, There is no other: The Dr. would undoubtedly answer, Common Sense, and the usual Method of interpreting such Passages, necessarily require us thus to understand it. The same I say in the present Case. For the Phrase, No other G O D, must be interpreted like all those that are parallel to it, and so must signify, no other Supreme G O D.

Thus, I think, it is very plain, that we are not chargeable with holding two G O D's. We utterly renounce that Error,

p. 24.

p. 16, 38.

A.

p. 31.

yes it is  
said not only  
there is  
many  
but many  
at all  
times

p. 35.

*main* Error. We plead for the Unity of G o d; and yet still maintain, that the Son is G o d; and reconcile this seeming Contradiction, as we do all others of the like Nature, viz. by saying, that the Father is the Supreme G o d, and the Son, God in a Subordinate Sense of the Word, or, as the *Nicene* Fathers express'd it, God of G o d.

IV. Of *Worship*.

The Word, *Worship*, as it is generally used, comprehends under it several parts, as Esteem, Love, Fear, Confession, Petition, Praise, Thanksgiving. Our Adversaries choose to treat of 'em all together, under the Word, *Worship*. But this occasions much Confusion in Peoples thoughts about this Matter. To avoid which, I shall consider them separately.

1. We ought to *esteem* every Being, that has any valuable Qualifications in it, according to the Degree of them.
2. We ought to *Love* every amiable Being, according to the Degree of its Amiability.
3. We ought to *Fear* every Person in proportion to the Degree of Power he has over us. We ought to esteem, love, and fear G o d Supremely, or above all, because he is the best, the most amiable, and the greatest of Beings. Yet we may esteem, and love a Good Man *Subordinately*, according to the Degree of his Goodness: And we may fear a King in proportion to the Authority he has over us. Here there is no difficulty; and 'tis plain that we must distinguish *Esteem*, *Love*, and *Fear*, into Supreme and Subordinate. And so all Divines do.

Again, we may *confess* our Sins to any Person that can hear us, against whom they were committed; to G o d, or to our Brethren. We may *ask* any one that hears us, any good things that are in his Power to bestow. We may *praise* any Person upon the Account of his real Excellencies. And we may *thank* any one that hears us, for the good he has done us. And according to the Nature of the Person, with whom we have to do, in any of these Respects; So must our Confession, Petition, Praise, or Thanksgiving be of a higher or of a lower Kind. This will be readily acknowledged: Since it is agreeable to Reason, and to the Practice of all Mankind, of the best Christians as well as others,

Let



Let us then suppose, that Christ is not the Father himself, but a distinct Spirit from him: Let us suppose him also to know our very Hearts (as he really does) and to have all Authority given him in Heaven and Earth: Let us consider, that he bestows on us all our Blessings, and is impower'd to forgive us: And then I cannot think, but any one would allow, that we might ask of him Pardon, or any other Blessings; and thank him, when we have received them. And tho' the Father is the original Author of all these Mercies; yet Christ, who, upon this Supposition, is the means of conveying them to us, undoubtedly deserves Thanks, Esteem, Love, Praise, tho' not in the same degree with the Father. So, we might well ask them of him, tho' 'tis the Father who Originally bestows them. However, upon this Scheme, it is plain, that our Prayers and Praises are chiefly to be offer'd to the Father, who has impower'd the Son to bless us, by giving him Authority to rule us, and to dispose of all things for the good of his People. And still there must, upon this Supposition, be this Difference, that we must ultimately ascribe all the Praise and Thanks to the Father, who is the Supreme Giver of them. The Father must be esteem'd and lov'd, as the principal Author, and the Son as his Agent in bestowing the Gifts.

This Account, I hope, is plain and intelligible. And I shall shew, that it is agreeable to the Scriptures. This I shall do by demonstrating,

I. That the Father is the Supreme and Ultimate Object of Worship.

II. That Christ is to be Worship'd only as Mediator. And,

III. That all the Worship, which is to be given to Christ, must and does redound to the Glory of his God and Father.

I. The Father is the Supreme, and Ultimate Object of Worship. That there can be but one such, Reason teaches, and Scripture confirms. The Scripture tells us, It is the most high God. But it may be inquired, whether this God be one Person, or three Persons? I think it plain, that he is but one Person. This appears from those very Texts which the Learned Dr. Waterland has collected, p. 230, 231. to prove, That all Religious Worship is appropriated to God only. The Texts are these:

these: Thou shalt have no other GODS before Me: Serve him: Him shalt thou serve: Him only shalt thou serve: Before me was there no GOD formed, neither shall there be after me: They glorified him not as GOD, because they served the Creature more than the Creator. In These Words, *Him, Me*, evidently denote *one Single Person* [see p. 15.] If it be farther asked, *Who is this Person*, here made the Object of Worship? I answer, from the New Testament, It is GOD the Father. This the Reader may observe in almost every Page. I shall cite a few plain Instances: John. iv. 23. *The true Worshipers shall Worship the Father*: (By the way then, are those the true Worshipers, who Worship the Father, Son, and Spirit together, as one Being?) 2. Cor. 12. 3. *Blessed be GOD, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Ephes. 1. 3. *Blessed be the GOD and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*: v. 16, 17. *Making mention of you in my Prayers, that the GOD of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto you the Spirit of Wisdom*. C. ii. 18. *Thro' him [Christ] we both [Jews and Gentiles] have an Access by one Spirit, unto the Father*. C. iii. 14. *I bow my Knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*. C. v. 20. *Giving thanks always for all things unto GOD and [or, even] the Father, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Matth. VI. 9. *Our Father, which art in Heaven*: v. 6. *Pray to thy Father, which is in secret*. To the same Purpose run all the Prayers, and all the Directions for Prayer, in the New Testament, excepting only two or three, that are directed to Christ. But the Reader will please to observe, that he never met there with one single Instance of a Prayer directed to the whole Trinity together. So that 'tis not the Trinity, but the Person of the Father, which is the Object of Worship. And all this Worship is to be offer'd up to the Father thro' the Mediation of Christ.

Before I pass on to the next Observation, I would desire the Reader to take Notice, that tho' this is plainly the Scripture Account of Worship (as all Men must acknowledge) yet the Presbyterians (however they pretend to be against unscriptural Terms of Communion) imposed a quite contrary Form of Worship, in their famous *Reformed Liturgy*. The larger Litany begins thus, 'O most holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three Persons, and one GOD — our Owner, Governor, and Father, hear,

&c.

' &c. Let thy holy Spirit dwell in us.' But is it not sufficiently absurd and unwarranted to call the whole Trinity, *Father*; and to say, 'O Father, Son, and Spirit, Let thy Spirit dwell in us?' Is the Spirit, the Spirit of the Spirit, as well as the Spirit of the Father? And when they speak of three Persons together, should they not say, Let *your* Spirit dwell in us? But enough of such gross Confusion. I chiefly design'd to observe, that however the Presbyterians have given us an Example of Praying to the three Persons together, yet the Apostles have not. And, let every Christian judge, whom he ought to imitate, St. Paul, or any such modern Liturgies.

II. Christ is to be worship'd only as Mediator. He is worship'd two ways; 1. When we offer up our Prayers, thro' him, to the Father. 2. When we offer them directly to him. But in both Cases, he is worship'd only as Mediator between GOD, and us. It is evidently so in the first Case, when we Pray to the Father, thro' Christ. Then, I am sure, he is not consider'd as the Supreme GOD. For all Men will readily own, that Christ, as Mediator, is inferior to the Father. Yet this is the most common way of worshipping Christ, as is apparent from the Scriptures, and from the Prayers of all Churches. And Dr. Waterland expressly says, p. 262. 'That our Prayers generally are to be offer'd rather thro' him, than to him. 2. When we offer up Prayers directly to Christ, we are to consider him only as Mediator. This appears from all those Texts, which give us a Reason, why we are to Worship Christ. The Reason is founded not upon his being the Supreme GOD, but upon his being the Mediator; and upon his receiving his Authority and Right to Worship, from the Father, as a Gift. Thus, John, v. 22, 23. The Father hath committed all Judgment unto the Son; That all Men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father. 'Tis not said, that all Men should honour the Son, because he is equal to the Father; but because the Father hath committed all Judgment to him; or hath made him Judge. Philip ii. 9, 10, 11, Wherefore GOD also hath highly exalted him and given him a Name, which is above every Name: That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow — and that every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord,

2. b. or Intercession

N. 40, 50, 54  
p. 43.

p. 44, 50.

i. e. after I have  
said, not in  
same Degree



to the Glory of GOD, the Father. Here is no Account of a Worship due to Christ, as he is the Supreme God, or of the same Substance with the Father. The Reason assign'd is, Because GOD exalted him, and gave him a Name above every Name. Rev. i. 5, 6. Unto him, that loved us, and wash'd us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests unto GOD and his Father; to him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever, Amen! The Reason of ascribing this Glory to Christ, is not his Equality to the Father; but his Loving and Washing us, as Mediator. Again, Rev. v. 12. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive Power, and Riches, and Wisdom, and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing. 'Tis not said, He is worthy to receive it, because he is of the same Substance with the Father; but because he was the Lamb Slain. But the Lamb Slain is the Mediator, or the Man Christ Jesus. And the Worship here ascribed to him, is what is due to him as Mediator. This is confirm'd by St. Stephen's Prayer, Act. vii. 59. Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit. He prays to him, under the Character of Lord Jesus. But Jesus was not essentially Lord, but was made such by the Father, as the Apostle testifies, Act. ii. 36. GOD hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord, and Christ. Whence it appears, that Lord signifies the Mediator; and so that St. Stephen worship'd him as Mediator. To the same purpose is that, Psal. xlv. 11. He is thy Lord [being made so] and worship thou him.

These Texts shew, That Christ is to be worship'd, as Mediator. And I advance, that he is to be worship'd only as Mediator, because the Scripture never gives us any Direction to worship him upon any other Account, or in any other Respect. If Dr. Waterland thinks, it does, he ought to have quoted the Place. Indeed the Dr. thinks to overturn all that has been said, by telling us positively, without proving, ' That the essential Dignity of Christ's Person is really the Ground and Foundation of Honour, and Esteem (and consequently of Worship, the highest Expression of both) which ought always to bear Proportion to the intrinsic Excellency of the Object: But his Offices, relative to us, are the moving Reasons, which principally affect our Wills; and without which we should want ' the

N. 12. . 2

N. 45.

N. 48.

amp  
N. 38, 44  
40.

' the strongest Incitement to pay that Honour and  
 ' Worship, which the essential Excellency of his Person  
 ' demands. Scripture has sufficiently apprized us  
 ' of both, discovering at once both his absolute and rela-  
 ' tive Dignity; that so we being instructed, as well con-  
 ' cerning what He is in himself, as what He is in Ref-  
 ' pect to Us, might understand what Honour justly  
 ' belongs to him, and want no Motive to pay it accord-  
 ' ingly.' In these Words, the Doctor raises a Mist be-  
 fore the Eyes of his Readers; and by saying something  
 that is true, seems to hope, that they would not observe  
 the want of Argument to confirm his main Assertion.  
 'Tis undoubtedly true, that the essential Dignity of Christ's  
Person is the Ground and Foundation of Honour and Esteem:  
 Since we ought to esteem and honour every Person in  
 proportion to his Excellency. And if Honour and Esteem  
 be called Worship, it is the Foundation of this sort of  
 Worship. But if we take Worship to signify Prayer and  
Thanksgiving, then the Doctor's Assertion is plainly false.  
 For the essential Dignity of Christ's Person is not the  
 Ground on which his Title to Prayer and Thanksgiving  
 is immediately built. Yea, the absolute Dignity of the  
 Father himself does not appear to be the only Founda-  
 tion of our Duty to pray to, and thank him. I take  
 the Truth to be plainly this; tho' GOD is a Being of  
 infinite Essential Perfections, and is to be esteem'd as  
 such: Yet no one would be obliged to Pray to him,  
 unless he exercised a Providence over the World. An  
Epicurean, who imagin'd that GOD did not at all concern  
 himself about human Affairs, but left Men intirely to  
 themselves and to Chance, could not think it necessary  
 to Pray to him for any Mercy. For, if GOD did not,  
 and would not give, he could have no Incouragement  
 to ask. But since GOD does actually Govern the World  
 by his Providence; we see a sufficient Reason to Pray  
 for his Blessing and Disposal of our Affairs. So that if  
GOD did not govern the World, there would be no  
 Foundation for Prayer: But since he does, there is.  
 'Tis much the same as to Thanksgiving. Since GOD  
 created us, and gives us from time to time, in his Pro-  
vidence, all the good things we have; we see a plain  
Obligation laid on us to thank him. But if he did not  
 exercise any Providence, or Government over Us, we  
 should

should not think our selves bound to thank him for any thing besides the Creation. And, if we were form'd by Chance (as the Epigureans atheistically said) we should not see any Reason to thank him for any thing at all; however great and many his own essential Perfections were. It is plain then, that God's Government of the World is the Foundation of this kind of Worship. And I the rather say this; since the Holy Ghost has expressly taught us the same, *Psal. xxii. 27, 28. All the Kindreds of the Nations shall Worship before thee. For the Kingdom is the Lord's; and he is the Governor among the Nations.*

I say the same of Christ: His Title to Prayer and Thanksgiving is founded on his Dominion or Government. If he was not impower'd to bestow Mercies on Us; I cannot see, why we should Pray to, or thank him for them; whatever his essential Dignity might be. If he is almighty, yet would not help me; Why should I pray for his Assistance? If he is wise, yet would not employ his Wisdom for my good; Why should I ask it, or, what should I thank him for? Indeed, I ought to admire, esteem, and honour him for such Perfections: But I should not be obliged to offer up Prayers and Thanks to him. It appears then, that Christ's Title to this Worship is founded upon the Authority he has over us. 'Tis true, his essential Excellencies, as he is the Son of God, qualify him for universal Dominion: But those Excellencies, without that Dominion, would not give him a right to this sort of Worship, that is, Prayer; which, taken in the largest Sense, I think, alone ought to be call'd Worship.

If this be so, the Doctor in vain endeavours to answer our Arguments for Christ's being worship'd only as Mediator, by making a Distinction between the Foundation, and the moving Reasons of Worship. For there is no Room for such a Distinction. Christ's Dominion over us is the Foundation of our Worshipping him, or is that which gives him a Title to it. And the very same Dominion, actually exercised in doing us good, is the Motive to pray to, and thank him.

All that the Dr. says farther, in the Passage just now cited, is unquestionably true, if he speaks only of Honour, and not of Prayer. But if he would have his Readers

N. 43.  
11.

N. 42

N. 38, 48.

N. That too  
gives him  
a right to  
pray to  
N. 41. & 42.



Readers think, that the Scripture has instructed us concerning what Christ is in himself, in order to found his Title to Worship merely upon that; I ask his Pardon for not believing it, till he quotes the Texts that assert it. I have cited Passages, which prove, that Christ is to be worship'd as Mediator, and as receiving Authority from the Father. And till some Texts are produced to prove, that he has a Title to Worship, on the account barely of his essential Excellencies, I shall maintain, that Christ is to be worship'd only as Mediator. The Reader may observe in the Doctor's Book, that tho' he asserts the contrary, yet he does not attempt to prove it. He says indeed, p. 275. 'I found the Son's Title to Worship upon the Dignity of his Person; his Creative Powers declared in John 1. and elsewhere; his being God, [God] from the beginning; and his preserving and upholding all things (according to Col. 1. 16, 17. and Heb. 1.) antecedently to his Mediatorial Kingdom.' 'Tis true, these Texts teach us, that Christ is God, and that he created, preserves, and upholds all things: But 'tis not said in these Places (nor indeed in any other) that therefore Christ is to be worship'd. And if the Scripture does not found his Title to Worship on these Powers, neither ought the Dr. to have done it.

III. I observe, that all the Worship, which is to be given to Christ, must and does redound to the Glory of his God and Father. This is expressly asserted by St. Paul, Philip. ii. 11. Every Tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father. The Word, Lord, in this place, evidently signifies the Mediator: for it is said, v. 9. That this Name was given him by God. And, To confess Christ to be Lord, may be applied to every way of expressing our Worship of him. That is, when we profess to believe, obey, or trust in him, we confess hereby, that he is our Lord. And when we pray to, or thank him, we thereby acknowledge him to be our Lord. But St. Paul says, that whatever way we confess him to be Lord, it must be to the Glory of God the Father. And indeed, it cannot be otherwise: For, when we confess, that Christ is made Lord by the Father, (Act. ii. 36.) We speak to the Glory of the Father, who made him Lord and Christ. And so in worshipping him, we worship

1. 2. W. H. P. says  
on Thanksg.  
page 43.

W. H. P. says  
on page 43.

ship the Father. This is evident from this Text. Dr. Waterland thinks to overturn this by saying, p. 255. 'As if it was any Question betwixt us, — whether the Honour of either did not redound to both.' I answer, tho' we read, that we must confess that Christ is Lord to the Glory of God the Father, yet we never read that we must confess the Father to be God to the Glory of the Lord Jesus Christ. And, I believe, no other Reason can be assign'd for this Difference, but that the Father is the ultimate Object of Glory and Worship, whereas Christ is to be worship'd only as Mediator. The Texts which the Dr. cites to prove, that the Father glorifies the Son, are nothing to this Purpose. A Superior may glorify, or make glorious, his Inferior: But Honour given to the Superior, can never be supposed to have a Reference to the Glory of the Inferior, as a higher end. A King may glorify an Ambassador: But Honour given to that King will not redound to the Glory of the Ambassador; tho' all Honour done to the Ambassador, as such, redounds to the Glory of his Sovereign. Thus Christ, who was made Lord, by the Father, is inferior to the Father: And so Worshipping the Father, does not redound to the Glory of the Son: Tho' the Honouring of the Son will redound to the Glory of the Father.

Besides this general Account, I shall shew how each particular Instance of what is call'd, Worshipping of Christ, redounds to the Glory of God the Father.

Believing on Christ, is reckon'd one part of Worship due to him. But our Faith must not terminate on Christ, but on the Father. So has our Lord assured us, John, xii. 44. He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that sent me: that is, He does not so much believe on me, as on the Father; or, his Faith does not terminate on me, but on the Father. He that believes, that Jesus is the Christ, or Anointed of God, does necessarily believe, that God anointed him. And he that trusts in Christ, who is sent from God; does necessarily trust chiefly in God who sent him; 2 Cor. iii. 4. It is to the Glory of God to believe in Christ: Because by believing in him, we believe the Record, which GOD gave of his Son, and so give him the Glory of his Truth. 1. John v. 9, 10. He that receiveth Christ, receiveth the Father, that sent him. Matth. x. 40. And our Lord adds,

38, 42  
God glorify  
in each of these  
to worship  
p. 10 X-

adds, *Mark, ix. 37. Whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me:* That is, 'He doth not so much receive me; as my Father; or, his receiving me, and thereby giving me Glory, does not glorify me alone; but this redounds to the Glory of the Father, who sent me: Even as he who receives an Ambassador, chiefly honours the Sovereign, who sent him. Our Faith in a risen Savior redounds Ultimately to the Honour of GOD the Father, who raised him from the Dead. 3.  
*Gal. i. 1. Rom. x. 9.* Thus has St. Peter taught us, *1 Pet. i. 21.* By him [Christ] you do believe in GOD, that raised him up from the Dead, and gave him Glory, that your Faith and Hope might be in GOD. Our Faith and Hope 4.  
 must not terminate on him, that was raised, but on the Father who raised him; nor must it terminate on him that received the Glory, but on GOD, who gave it. Thus our receiving, believing, trust, and hope in Christ redound to the Glory of GOD the Father, as the Ultimate Object of them. And answerably, all the Dishonour that is done to Christ, redounds to the Dishonour of GOD; as our Savior testifies, *Luke x. 16. He that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.*

Again, he that loveth Christ, the Image and only begotten Son of the Father, does not let his Love rest here; but it terminates on the Father that begat him, and whose Image Christ is. He that loves the Son for becoming the Propitiation for our Sins, cannot but chiefly love GOD, who loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation, *1 John iv. 10.* 5.

Swearing is an Act of Worship. But he that Swear- 2.  
 eth by Christ, does herein Swear by GOD the Father. For as our Savior said, *Matth. xxiii. 21. Whoso shall swear by the Temple, sweareth by it, and by him that dwelleth therein:* So, I believe I may argue, he that sweareth by Christ, sweareth by GOD, who dwelleth in him, *John xiv. 10.* and who is the Head of Christ. *1. Cor. xi. 3.* And so Swearing by Christ will ultimately redound to the Honour of GOD, the Father, even as Swearing by the Temple (if it were lawful) would have done. That is to say, our appealing to Christ as a Witness to the Truth of what we speak, tends to the Honour of GOD, the Father, who gave him his Knowledge; as we learn, *John viii. 26, 28. I speak those things which I have*



*a* have heard of him. — I do nothing of my self: But as my Father taught me, I speak these things. Rev. i. 1. The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him. And our Appealing to Christ as an Avenger of Falshood, does redound to the Glory of the Father, who gave him all Power in Heaven and in Earth. Matth: xxviii. 18.

*p. 44. 3.* Prayer is another Kind of Worship. He that prayeth to the Father, ~~thro'~~ the Mediation of Christ, evidently makes the Father the Ultimate Object of this Worship: And this apparently redounds to the Glory of God the Father. And when we pray directly to Christ, we are to consider him only as Mediator, receiving from the Father an Universal Authority, and a Power to bless us, and a Title to such Worship. And so all the Prayers and Praises which we offer to Christ will terminate on the Father, and redound to his Glory. We may thank and pray to Christ as the immediate Giver, and as one impower'd by the Father to Bless us: But this will redound to the Glory of the Father, who did impower him, and to whom therefore we are chiefly obliged. And he that prays to the Mediator in Obedience to God's Command, does by that Obedience Glorify and Worship God.

*4.* Obedience and Service is reckon'd another Part of Worship. But our Obedience to Christ, is also Obedience to God, and so redounds to his Glory. When we obey Christ, whom God has set over us, we chiefly obey God who exalted him. For the Commands which Christ has given us, are originally the Commands of the Father, which Christ received from him. Thus our Lord testifies, John xii. 49, 50. I have not spoken of my self: But the Father which sent me, he gave me a Commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know, that his Commandment is Life Everlasting: Whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak. The Commands of the Gospel are truly and Originally the Father's: And so whoever keeps them, doth really obey the Father. However, since the Mediator is impower'd to publish these Commands to us, and to rule us according to them, Men may be said to obey him. All our Obedience to Christ is Obedience to the Father upon two Accounts: (1) Because Christ's Commands are not originally his own, but the Father's.

Father's. (2.) Because one Command that the Father has given us, is, to obey Christ in all things. *Act. iii.*

22. So that in obeying Christ, we obey this particular Command of God. And thus our Obedience to Christ Ultimately redounds to the Glory of the Father. Thus, an *Israelite's* Obedience to *Moses* was indeed chiefly Obedience to God, from whom *Moses* received his Law, and who required the People to obey him.

Upon the whole then, take *Worship* to signify Faith, Love, Prayer, Obedience, or whatever else it can denote; and it will be found, that in worshipping Christ, we do, and cannot but worship the Father. The Sum of what I have said is this; we worship the Father as the Supreme God, from whom, as the Original, or Fountain, are all things: We worship the Son, as Mediator, by, or thro' whom all things come to us from the Father. In worshipping Christ, in this Respect, we chiefly worship the Father; both because the Father made him Lord, and gave him his Authority, and also because we herein obey the Father, who has commanded us to worship Christ. And so all the Worship, that we give to Christ, ultimately redounds to the Glory of the Supreme God, his Father, and his God.

This Account, which the Holy Scriptures give us of Religious Worship, is very plain and easy to be understood. And 'tis not difficult to see through the Objections, that Dr. *Waterland* raises against it: I have no Occasion to defend the Distinction of Supreme and Subordinate Worship: since I have not asserted it. Tho' if no more be meant by it than the Worship due to the Supreme God, and Worship due to the Mediator, who is Subordinate to God, I think it is easy to be defended. But to prevent needless Disputes, I have chosen to avoid this way of Speaking, and to use plainer English.

There is but one Objection in the *Doctor's* Discourse on this Head of Worship, which has any appearance of Weight in it, and that is, 'That all Religious Worship is [in Scripture] appropriated to God only.' If the *Doctor* means, that all Religious Worship must terminate in God only, or ultimately redound alone to his Glory; it is undoubtedly true, but nothing against us.

G

For

*W. P. H. says.  
The less is better;  
led in effect  
W. the Father's  
Supremacy & Son's  
Subordination  
are not only  
here asserted,  
but by Worship  
due to each is  
also in his name  
to distinguished*

p. 41.  
p. 41, 53.  
p. 46.  
p. 54.  
p. 22.

For I have asserted and proved the same. And our worshipping of Christ is not at all inconsistent with this, provided our Worship of him does not terminate upon him, but is refer'd to the Glory of the Father, as the ultimate Object of it. But if he hereby means that we must not offer to any other *Being*, besides the one Supreme God, even such Religious Worship as redounds to the Glory of God; this is plainly false. For Christ is to be worship'd as Mediator, as I have prov'd: Yet surely as Mediator he is Subordinate to God; and consequently not the Ultimate Object of Worship: But our Worship must pass thro' him to the Father. If there is Worship due to Christ upon the Account of his being God equal to the Father (which has not been proved) yet 'tis plain, that there is a Worship due to him consider'd as Mediator, distinct from that. He has a Title to Worship founded on his Exaltation, and on the Father's Gift, which therefore cannot belong to him, as Supreme God, but as he is the Mediator. This Worship, our Adversaries own, must terminate on the Father. And then they, as well as we, must acknowledge that we may offer to another Being, besides the one supreme God, such Religious Worship as redounds to the Glory of God.

But I proceed with the Objection. The learned Dr. to strengthen it, quotes our Lord's Words, *Matth. iv. 10. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy GOD, and him only shalt thou serve.* p. 230. It will help us to fix the meaning of this Command, if we consider parallel Expressions that are met with in the Scriptures. For it is natural to suppose that all like Expressions must be interpreted in the same Manner. And then we shall see how little Advantage this yields his Cause.

The difficulty arising from these Words, the Doctor thus expresses, p. 331. 'The Father is *worship'd* and the Son is *worship'd*, and yet we find no Foundation for asserting two Objects of Worship, or two Worships.' But it appears, from what I have already proved, that the difficulty ought to be express'd thus, The Father *only* is to be *worship'd*: *Him only* shalt thou serve. And yet the Son is to be worship'd. How shall we reconcile this seeming Contradiction? Dr. Waterland does it by supposing, that the Father and the Son are one Agent; which



which yet the Scripture never does. It directs us to solve the difficulty another way, as appears from the manner of solving all difficulties of the like Nature.

I. It is said in the Text before us, *Him only shalt Thou serve*. Yet we read, *Heb. xiii. 10.* That the Priests *serve the Tabernacle*. How would Dr. Waterland reconcile these Texts? Surely not by supposing, that the *Tabernacle* was the Supreme God; but by saying, that the Priests, in serving the *Tabernacle*, did serve God, who required them to serve it. And then would their Service of the *Tabernacle* have been inconsistent with serving God only, if their Service had terminated on the *Tabernacle*, or had not been commanded by God? in either of which Cases, they could not have been said to serve God.

II. It is commanded, *1. Sam. vii. 3.* *Prepare your Hearts unto the Lord, and serve him only*. And yet God expressly commands, saying, *Exod. xxi. 6.* *His Master shall bore his Ear thro' with an Awl; and he shall serve him [his Master] for ever*. But if a Man were to serve God alone; it may be ask'd, How could he then be allow'd to serve his Master? Tho' in a parallel Case the Doctor would infer, that two such Persons are the same Being, yet he will not admit such a Conclusion in this. He will not hence infer, that the *Master* here mention'd is the Supreme God. He will agree with me in reconciling it thus: The Servant might serve his Master, when he could at the same time, and in the same Instance, serve God. His being forbidden to serve any besides God, implies these two things; (1) That he should not set up any other Person as a Supreme and Ultimate Object of Service: And (2) That he should not serve his Master in any thing, but what God also has required of him. He that serves *Mammon*, breaks the Command of serving God only; since herein he does not serve God. For God has forbidden the Service of *Mammon*. Whereas, when a Servant is temperate (for instance) in Obedience to his Master, he therein serves God in two Respects; both as God has requir'd Temperance, and as he has also requir'd such Obedience to a Master. But he that serves his Master in any thing Sinful, does not therein serve God at all; but sets up his Master in the stead of God, and

27  
p. 16.

16

32, 43.

only serves  
has not  
forbidden

p. 32, 52.

so, I am sure, does not serve G O D only. The same thing may be express'd thus: *We must serve G O D only*; that is, we must serve no one in Opposition to G O D. When a Master commands what G O D has forbidden, a Servant must refuse to obey; because he is obliged to serve G O D only. But while a Master requires no more than what G O D has impower'd him to require, the Servant, in Obeying, will serve no one in Opposition to G O D, but will serve G O D only. Thus St. Paul determines, when he says *Coloss. iii. 22, 24. Servants obey in all things your Master—ye Serve the Lord Christ: That is, in serving them according to his Command*, and while they require the same that he does, ye do truly and chiefly serve him.

III. David says, *Pj. li. 4. Against thee [O G O D,] thee only have I sinned.* And yet no one questions, but that he sinned against Uriah also: Even as well as Saul is said to *Sin against his Servant, against David, 2 Sam. xix, 4.* To reconcile these things, we are obliged to say, that David means, he sinned against G O D chiefly; and that if what he did, had not been a Sin against G O D's Law, it would have been no Sin at all.

The Interpretation of these Commands directs us how to understand this before us, of worshipping G O D only. It must be understood to require us to make G O D alone the Ultimate Object of our Worship, or to terminate all Worship upon himself: It forbids us to worship others, any farther than he has commanded us to do it, and any farther than our worshipping of them is really a worshipping of him, and redounds to his Glory. Thus we must interpret it, answerably to the obvious meaning of all other like Commands express'd in the same manner. And let the Reader try, if he can devise a Reason, why this Precept should be interpreted one way, and the parallel ones another. If we must in no sense whatever worship any but G O D; why should it not be said also, that we must not, in any sense whatever, serve any but G O D? Or, on the other hand, if *To serve God only* signifies, *To terminate all our Service upon him*; Why must not this Phrase of worshipping G O D only, denote that all Worship must terminate on him?

Besides what I have already urged to prove that my Interpretation of the Command before us is just,

viz,

p. 54. 54.

as not  
forbidden

It is all nothing  
Opposite to the

M

p. 39.

p. 40.

viz. because we thus interpret all Commands express'd in the like manner; I add, that our Adversaries Scheme, as well as our's, necessarily requires the same Interpretation of it. It is agreed, that the Mediator, as such, is not the Supreme GOD: And that yet he is to be worship'd. It follows then, that the Worship of the Mediator is consistent with the Command of worshipping GOD only. But it could not be so, unless it be interpreted this way.

And if this Command must thus be interpreted, we easily see the Propriety of our Lord's urging it against Satan, when he desired to be worship'd; and the Weakness of the Doctor's Objection taken from thence. The Doctor's Words are p. 230. ' This was said in ' Answer to Satan, who did not pretend to be Supreme ' nor desire to be acknowledged as such (See Luke iv. ' 6.) All he requir'd was, that a solemn outward Act of ' Adoration and Worship should be paid him. And ' the Reason given for refusing it, is not that he was a ' bad Spirit, an Enemy to GOD, or that GOD had not ' commanded, that he should be worship'd; but the ' Reason is general, that none are to be worship'd but ' GOD only.' I answer, tho' Satan did not pretend to be Supreme, nor desire to be acknowledged as such; yet he desired to be acknowledged and worship'd as one having Authority deliver'd him from GOD over the World. For, says he, that is deliver'd unto me, and to whomsoever I will, I give it. But this was a false Pretence; as appears, not only from his being a bad Spirit; but also, because at that time it was delivered to no one at all. Unto the Angels hath not GOD put the World to come in Subjection, Heb. ii. 5. And Jesus was, at that time, made lower than the Angels. v. 9. And since this was a false Pretence, whosoever had worship'd Satan, as having such an Authority, would have transgress'd the Command of worshipping GOD alone. For such a one would not herein have worship'd GOD at all; since GOD had not committed this Authority to Satan. And the Worship, which Satan desired, would not have redounded at all to the Honour of GOD, but would have terminated on Satan: So that it would have been evidently inconsistent with the Precept, even as I have explain'd it. And upon the same Account, the Worship of all false GOD's and Idols is contrary



to this Command ; even because the worshipping of them could not possibly be a worshipping of G O D, or re-  
bound ultimately to his Glory. But the worshipping  
 of the Mediator is not contrary to this Command ;  
 since the Father gave him his Authority over us, and  
 also commanded us to worship him ; and so all our  
 Worship of the Mediator is really worshipping of  
 G O D, and terminates in him as the ultimate Object of  
 Worship.

Hence it appears, that we do not make two Objects  
 of Worship. Two Objects of Worship, signifies two ultimate  
 Objects of Worship, on whom it terminates : Even as,  
Two Objects of Service, or Love, signifies two ultimate Ob-  
 jects, on whom our Service and Love terminate. But  
 'tis obvious at first sight, that we are not guilty of  
 this ; since we make the Father, the ultimate Ob-  
 ject of all Worship, and give no Worship to the Son  
 but what redounds to the Glory of the Father.

They make two Objects of Worship, who Worship  
 two Supreme, equal Persons ; and suppose not that the  
 worshipping of one of them does terminate on the  
 other. They, who worship the Son as Supreme G O D,  
 make him another ultimate Object of Worship, contrary  
 to the Command. I wish this were more consider'd  
 by such as condemn us. For they would soon see Rea-  
 son to censure their own, rather than our Practice.

I hope I have made it appear, that there is no  
 Weight in these common Objections, against our Scheme,  
 taken from the Unity and Worship of G O D. And, if  
 I am not mistaken, Dr. Waterland himself has in one  
 Passage given up both Points to us. He grants, p. 260 ;  
 ' Tho' Christ be God and Creator, yet the Father is so  
 ' primarily, and eminently, as Father and first Person : And  
 ' therefore the distinct Worship of the Son, consider'd  
 ' as a Son, redounds to the Father as the Head, and  
 ' Fountain of all. Hence it is, that as the Father is pri-  
 ' marily and eminently G O D, Creator, and Object of  
 ' Worship ; so also all Worship is primarily and emi-  
 ' nently the Father's.' I cannot see any meaning in these  
 Words, unless the Doctor maintains, that the Father alone  
 is the Supreme G O D, and ultimate Object of Worship ;  
 and that the Son is God in a lower Sense, and to be wor-  
 ship'd only as Mediator. For if the Father be primarily G O D,  
 &c.

&c. He must suppose the Son to be *secondarily* God, *secondarily* Creator, and *secondarily* an Object of Worship. And if the Father be *eminently* GOD, &c. then the Son must be so, *not eminently*, but *subordinately*, that is, he must be, upon the *Doctor's* Principles, GOD in a subordinate, or lower sense of the Word: That is, that the Father alone is the *Supreme* GOD, and the Object of Worship, and the Son is God in a lower Sense, and to be worship'd only as *Mediator*; which is the very thing that I undertook to demonstrate.

## F I N I S.

## ERRATA.

Page 16. Line 2. for *Opinions*, read *Opinion*. l. 18. for *expose*, read *express*.  
 p. 18. l. 34. for *readest*, read *leddest*. p. 27. l. 12. for 3, read 31. l. 16.  
 for *Rom.* 1. 10. read v. 10. p. 38. l. 2. for *mainain*, read *maintain*. p. 40.  
 l. 36. for *Scripture, Account*, read *Scripture-Account*.

---

*Newly Printed for* JOHN CLARK.

*Just Publish'd,*

I. The History of *New-England*. Containing an impartial Account of the Civil and Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Country to the Year of our Lord 1700. To which is added, the Present State of *New-England*. With a new and accurate Map of the Country; and an Appendix, containing their present Charter, their Ecclesiastical Discipline, and their Municipal Laws. By the Reverend Mr. DANIEL NEAL. In two Volumes, 8vo. Price 8s.

1. the

II. The Church, and Dissenters compared, as to Persecution. In some Remarks on Dr. Walker's Attempt to recover the Names and Sufferings of the Clergy that were sequestred, &c. between 1640, and 1660. By the Rev. EDMUND CALAMY, D. D.

III. Certain Propositions, by which the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity is so explain'd, according to the Ancient Fathers, as to speak it not contradictory to Natural Reason. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Edward late Lord Bishop of Gloucester. Price 2 d.

IV. The Western Inquisition: Or, a Relation of the Controversy, which has been lately among the Dissenters in the West of England. By Mr. James Peirce. Price 2 s.

V. A Letter to Mr. Cumming, concerning the Regard which ought to be had to Scripture-Consequences. By the Reverend Mr. John Evans. The Second Edit. pr. 3 d.

VI. A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Tong, Mr. Robinson, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Reynolds. Occasion'd by the late Differences amongst the Dissenters. Wherein is consider'd the Regard Dissenters ought to pay to human Forms in Matters of Faith. With some General Remarks on their late Book. To which is added, An Appendix, containing Two Letters sent by some Dissenting Gentlemen to their Ministers: And other Papers. By a Layman. The Second Edition. Price 1 s.

VII. The Conduct of Ministers, with respect to Themselves and their Doctrines, consider'd; in a Sermon preach'd at Frome, in the County of Somerset, at the Ordination of Mr. Thomas Morgan. By the Rev. Mr. N. Billingaley. To which is added, Mr. Morgan's Confession of Faith, and Mr. Bowden's Exhortation at the Close. The Third Edition. Price 1 s.

VIII. Seasonable Advice relating to the Present Disputes about the Holy Trinity: Address'd to both the Contending Parties. Price 6 d.

*In a Few Days will be Publish'd,*

XI. A Vindication of the true Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Words of our Saviour and his Apostles. Design'd to lay the present Heats among Dissenters. Price 4 d. or 3 s. 6 d. a Dozen.

4 DE 60